

LaRouche rebuts Defense Department's 'Strategy for the Americas'

by Mel Klenetsky

On Oct. 11, 1995, Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche released a major policy statement on national security entitled "The Blunder in U.S. National Security Policy." The 70-page statement, in the form of a rebuttal to a September 1995 report released by the Department of Defense's (DOD) Office of International Security Affairs entitled *United States Security Strategy for the Americas*, is offered for the purpose of defining a sane security policy for the United States.

To begin, LaRouche identifies "the ongoing global economic crisis and the associated threats of war, bloody insurrections, and expanded international terrorism now arising throughout the world," as the real security threat to the nation and its people. LaRouche uses the fallacies of the DOD *Strategy for the Americas* report to expose the deeper bureaucratic and related dysfunctions that have to date prevented the U.S. government from recognizing and responding to the ongoing strategic threat.

"As of this date of writing," the candidate warns, "the world's present monetary and financial systems are being devastated by the fast approach of the greatest financial firestorm in history. Perhaps a few weeks from now, or perhaps a number of months later, the already severe storms hitting world markets, will reach the stage of general financial holocaust on a world scale."

This process is being exacerbated by the problem of increasing conflict over "ethnicity." "Those two, interrelated factors, financial collapse and spreading 'ethnicity' and other armed conflict, are the leading threat to U.S. security, both at home and in every region of the world. Nothing in the DOD report recognizes that subsuming reality. . . . Every leading assumption embedded in that report, will be left, dead and rotting jetsam on the beach of tragic folly, in the aftermath of the presently incoming financial storms."

Strategy for the Americas states that leveraging defense assets for the promotion of "democracy" and "open markets" must be the core of national security policy. It is these axiomatic assumptions that LaRouche rips apart. He writes: "The DOD report's central argument on these matters of 'democracy' and economic policies, is the false assertion, that democracy is progressing nicely, and that that 'market' policy which is, in fact, responsible for the economic collapse and increase in death-rates, must be continued."

In fact, the opposite is the case. "Up to this time," LaRouche states, "democracy is no longer possible in Africa, nor Asia, nor Central and South America, nor in the former Soviet Union, and will not long continue, even vestigially, inside the United States itself—without early and drastic reversal of policies typified by House Speaker Newt Gingrich's 'Contract on America.'"

The Presidential candidate characterizes as "buncombe" and "outright lies" statements in the DOD report that sweeping changes driven by democratic and market-driven reforms have propelled South and Central America forward, making the Americas a zone of expanding opportunity. LaRouche stresses that the economies of Central and South America have collapsed over the past 25 years; this process has made the political situation in Ibero-America, less, not more, democratic.

Thatcher and Bush's deadly legacy

LaRouche identifies the Thatcher-Bush legacy and the ruinous economic policies of the 1969-93 period as a crucial obstacle that the Clinton administration has had to overcome. Unfortunately, "the efforts of the Clinton administration to reverse several of the worst features of the Thatcher-Bush strategic doctrines, have been often smothered in frustration," and the "unfortunate outcome of the November 1994 mid-term elections" has greatly increased the difficulty of "ridding our policy-making of its suicidal Thatcher-Bush legacy."

LaRouche uses President Bush's Russia policy as a prime example of the fallacies of the DOD report. The fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union, he writes, opened a window of opportunity to the world, which the Thatcher government and the Bush administration thoroughly sabotaged. Describing the British monarchy and Thatcher policies of denying industrialization to East Germany and the former Soviet Union, LaRouche writes, "The unlikely Circe, Elizabeth II's Britain, like her ancestor Edward VII, embraced Russia with great affection for its early destruction. Germany must not be permitted to retool the economy of East Germany. The industrial and scientific potential of eastern Europe must be destroyed; London's anti-Germany policy of 1989-95 could be better named 'a Morgenthau Plan for Russia.' . . . The 'Reform,' as pushed by both the Thatcher and Bush governments, transformed Russia and Ukraine, rapidly, from scientific-industrial powers, into starving

‘Third World’ nations, stripped of industry and agriculture, living on the sales of exported raw materials to Anglo-Dutch financier interests—at bargain prices, and dependent upon high-priced food, imported from the Anglo-Dutch-Swiss cartel interests, to avert widespread famine.”

This policy, LaRouche explains, was the 1990s continuation of the British “balance of power” policy that set the stage for the two world wars. Britain’s King Edward VII first put the doctrine forward at the beginning of the century. LaRouche explains how the British monarchy’s geopolitical dogma was motivated by fear of a U.S. revival of anti-British-colonial Lincolnesque traditions, on the one hand, and concerns that the 1890s treaty agreements between France and Russia would become the basis for a Franco-German-Russian commitment to railway corridor-based development of the Eurasian land-mass, from Brest in France, to the Pacific and Indian oceans.

“The continued U.S. commitment to plan for the risk of a Twentieth Century war between the U.S.A. and the British Empire, was typified by pre-World War II, U.S. war-plans Red (against Britain) and Orange (against Britain’s Japan ally),” LaRouche writes. “War Plan Red, which echoed President Lincoln’s war-plan against the British Empire, continued as part of U.S. policy into the mid-1930s. Near the beginning of this present century, the British monarchy’s greatest fear was, that the United States, under a traditionalist U.S. patriot such as President William McKinley, might make common cause with the 1890s Eurasian development perspectives of France’s Gabriel Hanotaux, Germany’s Wilhelm Siemens, and Russia’s Count Sergei Witte. To prevent that, an assassination of a U.S. President, and the unleashing of London’s Balkan war and the Triple Entente alliance, led into World War I.”

“Little more than a decade after the Versailles Treaty,” LaRouche writes, “the same ‘balance of power’ logic impelled London to put Adolf Hitler into power in Germany (and to aid his consolidation of power into 1938), in order to foster the kind of war between Germany and the Soviet Union which would obliterate the possibility of continental Europe uniting the Eurasia continent in support of development policies such as the pre-World War I plans of Russia’s Count Sergei Witte.” LaRouche explains that the same geopolitical thinking went into the British support of Serbian aggression today, which fostered the current Balkan crisis, all for the purposes of preventing a German reunification and an East-West economic integration policy premised on industrial development and expansion. “Bush’s unfortunate support for this doctrine,” LaRouche writes, “has created the possibility of a new nuclear-war potential, or something comparably nasty, from within the region of the former Soviet Union.”

Initiatives to defeat British geopolitics

LaRouche discusses his two policy initiatives of the 1980s that were designed to destroy these British “balance

of power” doctrines. First, was his proposal, first publicly expressed in a 1980 Presidential campaign statement, for a ballistic missile defense policy that was subsequently reflected in President Reagan’s March 23, 1983 announcement of a Strategic Defense Initiative. LaRouche’s SDI policy was aimed at destroying the British nuclear “balance of power” doctrine, designed by Lord Bertrand Russell, and known as Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD). LaRouche envisioned the SDI policy as one which both superpowers would embrace. The ensuing crash program for developing a ballistic missile defense system based on new physical principles would have had the dual effect of providing a defensive umbrella against any first-strike potentials that had emerged within the MAD doctrine, while simultaneously initiating a “science driver” program that would have had significant technical-scientific spillovers into the civilian economies of both superpowers.

LaRouche’s second key policy initiative was his “Paris-Berlin-Vienna Productive Triangle” proposal, which he first outlined on Columbus Day, 1988. Taking the spherical triangle defined by the cities of Paris, Vienna, and Berlin, LaRouche defined this as the area of greatest potential for future development, given its concentration of skilled labor power and infrastructure. By mobilizing the capital-intensive productive potential within this area, and linking it to “‘spiral arms’ of high-density development corridors, from the Atlantic Coast at Brest in France, southward and eastward throughout Eurasia, and into the development of Africa and beyond,” LaRouche defined the mechanisms by which the Warsaw Pact countries could be integrated into the West. If this had been done, not only would the former nations of the Warsaw Pact be freed from the yoke of International Monetary Fund (IMF) “shock therapy,” but developing sector nations, too, would have shaken loose from the hated IMF “conditionalities” that have created starvation, disease, and strife.

Terrorism in the Americas

Another aspect of the DOD’s *Strategy for the Americas* report which the candidate lambasts, concerns terrorism in the Americas. LaRouche slams as false the report’s assertion that the impact of insurgent and guerrilla forces in the Americas has decreased: “The impact of the terrorist forces associated with the São Paulo Forum, the chief terrorist political cover of Central and South America, has not decreased; it has greatly increased during the recent several years.”

LaRouche demonstrates the common features of drugs- and weapons-trafficking in these terrorists operations, and locates their origins within London’s geopolitical “balance of power” doctrines. Terrorism, he maintains, has to be understood from the standpoint of modern irregular warfare. Citing the case of Eurasia, he writes that the “principal narco-terrorism force is represented by (chiefly) Pakistan-based mujahideen veterans of the Anglo-American conduct of the

Afghan War. . . . These mujahideen, created chiefly by the Anglo-American 'Iran-Contra' operations directed by Vice President Bush, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, et al., constitute, in and of themselves, a mercenary legion of irregular-warfare killers."

In Eurasia, Africa, and the Americas, virtually all current terrorist activity and active potential is organized around three ideological themes: ethnicity, radical religious sectarianism, and "ecology," LaRouche states. "In the Americas, the role of the Asia mujahideen, [Tamil] Tigers, and Khmer Rouge is filled by principally two groups, the London-linked, Fidel Castro-led São Paulo Forum, the principal terrorists' 'mother' organization for the Central and South America region, and the Forum-linked, London-based Revolutionary Communist Party."

For LaRouche, the dangerous fallacies embedded in the DOD report are symptomatic of a deeper problem of the federal bureaucracies. He writes, "The collective memory of our native U.S. populists appears to have forgotten the battle, which the U.S. Constitution lost, against the man who created the future Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and who did the most to further the cancerous spread of other oppressive instrumentalities of an arrogant and oppressive federal bureaucracy: President Theodore Roosevelt." LaRouche warns that since the 1960s, with the assassination of President Kennedy, British liberalism and free trade dogmas have gained ground, in opposition to our constitutional institutions, within many of the federal bureaucracies. LaRouche writes, "For the sake of such utopian, sociological trash of Eighteenth Century 'cabinet diplomacy,' the U.S. national-security bureaucracy has abandoned those competencies in natural science, history, and engineering, upon which West Point and Annapolis depended for their earlier tradition of professional excellence."

It is these deeper issues that the candidate addresses in the latter half of his paper, entitled "The Hypotheses Which Underlie Strategy." "In these perilous months before all nations of this planet," LaRouche writes, "the fluctuations between sterile pragmatic compromises, and violent extremes of populist radicalism, are, in practice each and all but varieties of suicidal lunacy. . . . There is not a single family, in the United States, or any other part of this planet, who will not suffer horrors beyond the capacity of the imagination . . . unless all simple-minded, common-sensical varieties of pragmatic or violent proposed solutions are rejected, and a reasoned grasp of historical principle applied, instead."

Modern, universal, and current history

Modern history, according to LaRouche, goes back 500 years to the period of the Golden Renaissance, when the combined effects of the Council of Florence and the emergence of the first modern nation-state under France's Louis XI provided for the ensuing dramatic improvement in population-potential, demographics, and productive powers of la-

bor. A universal education policy, based on the principle that all men are made in the image of God, enabled the arts and sciences to flourish. The modern nation-state was able to foster and absorb these tendencies so that scientific and technological progress led to increases in the productive powers of labor.

The last 500 years of history have been dominated by a battle between the advocates of the Golden Renaissance and the modern nation-state, on one side, in opposition to Venice and its British and Dutch clones, on the other. "From A.D. 1510, until beginnings of the British Empire about 1763," LaRouche writes, "tiny Venice dominated Europe. . . . It ruled by the old Roman method of 'divide and conquer,' otherwise known today by such rubrics as 'balance of power' and 'geopolitics.' "

"Do not be distracted by those 'balance of power' conflicts in and of themselves," LaRouche cautions. "The real conflict is between the institution of the modern nation-state and the relics of the pre-Fifteenth Century oligarchical institutions, such as feudal landlords and usurious financier nobilities. . . . The indispensable lesson of strategy, which the government of the United States must re-learn now, is that the relics of feudal oligarchism have been able to retain, and, lately, increase their political and financial power over this planet, solely because nation-states, such as the United States, behaved like fools, in allowing themselves to be trapped into feuds with other nation-states, rather than joining with other nation-states to eliminate the common enemy, the international financier oligarchy which is presently centered in London."

Current history, for LaRouche, begins with the death of President Franklin Roosevelt, who had committed himself and the United States to replacing the former British, Dutch, and French colonies which had served as pawns in British geopolitical strategies, with self-governing nations. With Roosevelt's death, Truman fell hook, line, and sinker for Churchill's "geopolitics as usual."

President Kennedy's policies, which included such things as the Apollo Project and his investment tax credit, started to break the British postwar stranglehold. We have been in a crisis for the past 30 years, which starts for LaRouche with the Cuban missile crisis and the assassination of President Kennedy. The 1962 Cuban missile crisis, negotiated by Bertrand Russell, established the MAD doctrine, which defined the nuclear "balance of power" doctrine of the past three decades. LaRouche maintains that the Vietnam War occurred as it did because of Russell's "peace initiative" of 1962 and the 1963 assassination of President Kennedy. From this point on, the British have had an even greater stranglehold on U.S. policy, ruthlessly ramming "post-industrial utopianism" through every U.S. institution that they could influence.

"The characteristic feature of the present collapse of global civilization," LaRouche asserts, "is that this is a global

economic catastrophe, a catastrophe which is directly traceable to a 'cultural paradigm-shift' introduced on a mass-scale to European civilization, and beyond, at about the same time that U.S. President John F. Kennedy was assassinated, and British intelligence services were engaged in continued efforts to bring about the assassination of France's President Charles de Gaulle.

"Under the impact of this radical change in popular beliefs and governmental practice, the United States was transformed from a nation built upon commitment to fostering investment in scientific and technological progress, into a decadent, collapsing 'post-industrial utopia.' "

Universal history, LaRouche explains, is defined by the ability of the human species to foster increases in its potential relative population-density, a process that places man apart from and superior to all other animal species. LaRouche examines increases in potential relative population-density from the standpoint of the increase in the average productive powers of labor, as measured in increases in the required market-baskets of physical consumption in correlation with improvements in the demographic characteristics of the population.

The battle of the past 500 years was more than a fight between the advocates of free trade and usury, on one side, and the republican sponsors of the modern nation-state, on the other. It was a fight between two world outlooks, with two conceptions of man, and two conflicting cultural paradigms. There is an oligarchical principle, which seeks to subjugate men for the sake of an elite class, and the doctrines of usury and ground rent, to ensure the domination of 5% of the population over the rest. This is the outlook championed by the Conservative Revolution gang of Newt Gingrich.

LaRouche takes us back to Paolo Sarpi, the Venetian Servite monk, as the leading proponent of this Aristotelian faction. Sarpi's followers included Hobbes, Locke, Voltaire, Hume, Giammaria Ortes, Adam Smith, Jeremy Bentham, and John Stuart Mill. These gentlemen, LaRouche says, premise their social theory on a bestialized notion of human nature, which is what is taught as social theory, unfortunately, in most universities today. The malthusian-environmentalist doctrines which posit man as a violator of nature typify these oligarchical dogmas. These are the advocates of the Enlightenment and British Liberalism, whose anti-industrial, malthusian outlook has helped spawn the "post-industrial utopianism" of the 1960s and '70s and the Thatcherite-Bush-Gingrich Conservative Revolution of the 1980s and '90s.

Sarpi, a mathematician, was the controller of Sir Francis Bacon and Galileo Galilei. They established a mechanistic-percussive tradition in the sciences. This is the Galileo-Descartes-Newton-Euler faction in mathematical physics, whose later adherents hold up entropy, statistical causality, and indeterminacy as higher principles.

In contrast, LaRouche says, it is the republican faction, the heirs of the traditions of the Golden Renaissance and

Plato, who have been responsible for the great breakthroughs in the arts and sciences. This is the tradition of Kepler, Leonardo, and Leibniz. LaRouche cites the classic strophic poems of Shelley and Keats; Mozart's and Beethoven's development of "motivic-thorough-composition"; and the scientific breakthroughs of Bernhard Riemann and Georg Cantor in developing a higher theory of manifolds and the mathematical transfinite, as all reflecting this continuing Renaissance tradition. LaRouche discusses the coherence of these principles in art, poetry, and the sciences, which are rooted in the principle that all men are made in the image of God.

LaRouche mocks the empiricist when he asks, "What is the size and weight of the thought which distinguishes a perception from a valid metaphor?" Demonstrating the inadequacies of formal logic, computers, and algebraic approaches, LaRouche discusses the only means by which not-entropic effects are produced. "One," he says, "is the action of living processes from materials assembled from non-living ones. The other is the cognitive processes of the individual human mind. . . . This not-entropic quality is called 'Reason' by Johannes Kepler, and . . . 'necessary and sufficient reason' by Gottfried Leibniz."

It is man's "Reason," LaRouche says, which leads to the creative breakthroughs in the arts and the sciences, a "not-entropic" quality that no formal mathematical physics can capture, which is responsible for the increases of potential relative population-density, the substance and driving force of universal history.

LaRouche concludes by calling for an end to the gnostic Enlightenment and British Liberalism's grip on the world, to remove the ideological underpinnings that have allowed the institutions of government to so dramatically fail to deal with the crises that we now face. As for the financial crisis, LaRouche writes, "The world economy could be saved, but only through measures which would mean the end of the power of the London-centered international financier oligarchy." From this perspective, LaRouche outlines how to reestablish Hamilton's American System of political-economy, which has, "to date, performed brilliantly whenever and wherever it has been employed."

To achieve this, LaRouche calls for replacing the Federal Reserve System with a U.S. national bank, committed to fostering scientific and technological progress in public infrastructure and private entrepreneurship. LaRouche concludes with a short list of principles for a sane national security policy. These include assuring that the U.S. economy can feed and take care of its people through its own productive capabilities; defending the modern, sovereign nation-state and developing a community of sovereign nation-states on the basis of a community of mutual interest and moral principles; and strengthening the moral viability of such a community by fostering scientific and technological progress in the development of the productive powers of labor.