War Threat Analysis

Atlanticists Push For World Fascism And Confrontation With Soviets

July 31 (NSIPS) — Beginning with Democratic presidential candidate Jimmy Carter's statement published July 25 that as president he would integrate a policy of "pre-emptive nuclear first strike" into U.S. strategic defense posture for the first time in U.S. presidential politics, the world was subjected to a series of Atlanticist moves that day-by-day brought it to within inches of thermonuclear war.

The cause of the danger is the Atlanticist commitment — reaffirmed by the Trilateral Commission-run West German weekly Die Zeit — to immediatley impose fascist looting policies on the entire advanced capitalist sector and the Thrid World. Die Zeit's stated commitment to a policy of Nazi "Arbeitsdienst" in the advanced sector was accompanied by stepped up Atlanticist moves to trigger "destabilization" scenarios throughout Latin America and Africa, as well as key areas of Southern Asia. The destabilization moves are intended to eliminate every potential obstacle to genocide of hundreds of millions of the world's population, every potential or actual Third world supporter of international debt moratorium, and, with them, every potential or actual Third World ally of the Warsaw Pact nations.

Such a new world alignment of forces, leaving the Warsaw Pact isolated against a fascist, militarized West and a hostile Atlanticist controlled Third World, would be an intolerable threat to the Warsaw Pact's strategic defense posture, and would leave them no alternative but war.

Accompanying the threat to the Warsaw Pact of a fascist — Carter — in the White House is the increasing hegemony of a fascist policy in Kissinger's faithful satrapy, West Germany. The Atlanticist-controlled West German press this week accompanied its joy over Carter's revival of Hitler's "Arbeitsdienst" by printing a statement by neo-Nazi Franz-Josef Strauss that the present situation reminds him of the 1930s, and by calling for food warfare against the German Democratic Reiublic. The week's Atlanticist ravings culminated as NATO Supreme Commander Gen. Alexander Haig personally dictated an article to Adelbert Weinstein, the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung's long-time military writer, which touted the readiness and morale of the U.S. in Germany to fight a conventional tank war against the Warsaw Pact.

Direct threat of NATO military operations near the borders loomed with the threat of armed conflict between Greece and Turkey.

In the Third World, the Atlanticists undertook redoubled provocations in the Middle East, renewed destabilization attempts in East Africa and the Sahara, provocations in the Persian Gulf, and attacks on the few remaining non-fascist governments of Latin America, in an attempt to head off rapidly accelerating motion by the Third World toward unilateral declaration of debt moratorium at the upcoming Group of 77 meeting in Colombo, Sri Lanka. These Third World moves have growing support from the Comecon sector and anti-Atlanticist forces in the West.

Each arena of Atlanticist push for fascism and destabilization represents a potential "Sarajevo" — a flashpoint that could touch off thermonuclear World War III between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

The Nature of the War Threat

Well aware that their policy of imposing fascist police state regimes throughout the advanced-capitalist and developing sectors will lead them into confrontation with the Warsaw Pact, the Atlanticists have set in motion what they envisage will be a "step-by-step" thermonuclear facedown over one of their "Sarajevos" — as in Cuba in 1962 — sometime between now and 1978, in which a "soft" Soviet leadership will back down from the threat of thermonuclear destruction, and certify its acquiescence before the new pro-fascist strategic balance of power.

The fallacy in Atlanticist reasoning is that Soviet defense posture is not based on any of their scenarios, it is based on preventing any overall realignment of forces which irreversibly compromises the Warsaw Pact defense posture. From the Soviet standpoint, the point of war has been reached when the Soviet leadership sees no other way of preventing the imposition of fascism in the West, and when Kissinger, Rockefeller, Ball and Co. succeed in wiping out pro-development forces in the Third World. For the Soviets, the question of when the 'trip-wire' has been crossed is not a question, therefore, of any particular situation, but the question, of at what point do overall Atlanticist moves threaten an irrevocable, decisive shift in the global balance of forces away from the Warsaw Pact.

From this standpoint, Atlanticist experts such as Barry Blechman indicated in interviews this week, the Atlanticists do not even possess an accurate criterion for determining when the Soviet's "tripwire" might be passed. The conceptual difficulty of Kissinger, Haig, Blechman, et al. is that their military strategy is based on a game of "chicken," winning a war by bluff, diplomatic maneuvers, psychological tricks, or anything short of fighting. Even though Carter formally disavows the "Schlesinger Doctrine" of limited nuclear war, Atlanticist strategic posture which he endorses holds one of the basic premises of the Schlesinger: that all-out thermonuclear exchange is the upper limit of modern war-fighting.

If their trip-wire is crossed, stated Soviet defense policy is based on a war-winning strategy: go to war at the first opportune moment, beginning with an all-out thermonuclear missile attack against the U.S. and Canada. In Western Europe, Warsaw Pact forces are deployed to saturate all NATO defense capabilities using a combination of atomic, biological, and chemical weapons. Following such "ABC" sterilization" of the pockets of NATO military strength, Warsaw Pact armored forces strike in shock-attack through the "sterilized" areas, crossing the Rhine within approximately 24 hours of the initial war attacks.

Soviet Warnings to West

The Soviets repeatedly and urgently signalled this week that success of the Atlanticist policy of world fascism and genocide would leave them no other option.

The day prior to Carter's ravings about "pre-emptive strike," the Soviet government daily Izvestia published a feature article warning that the danger of the re-emergence of fascism in West Germany cannot be underestimated. The article noted that leading West German spokesmen have sought recently to justify Hitler's invasion of the USSR as a necessary "pre-emptive" measure, and warned the BRD population not to forget the consequences of Hitler's move.

While the Soviet military daily Red Star tersely reported Carter's first-strike threat, the German Democratic Republic military paper Volksarmee, carried a feature on Carter which stressed his submarined warfare background and his ties to Dean Rusk, identified as former president of the Rockefeller Foundation, and "anti-Soviet" Zbigniew Brzezinski.

At the end of the week, the Soviets announced the promotion of Defense Minister Dimitri Ustinov — heralded as a 'soft-liner' by the Rand Corporation flacks when he was appointed last spring — to the rank of Marshal of the Soviet Union, the USSR's

highest military rank, joining CPSU General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev, who was appointed Marshal last spring. Ustinov's promopion makes the Soviet leadership officially a war-time command staff.

Pointing to Atlanticist moves in Europe, Brezhnev personally denounced the U.S.. France, and West Germany for their economic blackmail of Italy in a rare interview in Pravda yesterday. "Certain circles are aiming to grab Italy by the throat," Brezhnev stated. At the same time, a widely circulated Tass release this week referred to West Germany as the "weapons factory for NATO."

In the Third World, the Soviets underscored their vital interests in the Middle East with a major peace initiative in Pravda. The statement emphatically restated Soviet commitment to defend the Palestine Liberation Organization. The East bloc press also reported that Iraqi President Bakr has sent a personal message to Brezhnev warning that the Lebanese situation is grave and requires urgent action. The Soviets also this week denounced U.S. destabilization moves in the Caribbean.

The determining issue over whether there will be war in the immediate months ahead is whether the Atlanticists are successful in stopping the Third World push for debt moratoria. They may yet win that battle, but it will be the last battle they live to fight.

Carter Advocates "First Strike"

July 29 (NSIPS) — Following are excerpts from Democratic Presidential candidate Jimmy Carter's remarks to Hearst newspaper interviewers where the candidate stated, for the first time in U.S. presidential politics, that a U.S. pre-emptive nuclear first-strike would be an element of U.S. defense posture in a Carter Administration. These excerpts are taken from the Boston Herald Advertiser, under a full-column front-page banner headline, "Carter: I'd use nuclear weapons" under the kicker, "If U.S. security is threatened..."

Mr. Smith: Do you forsee any circumstances in which we would be justified in resorting to a first strike with nuclear weapons, strategic or tactical?

Governor Carter: I don't know the answer to those questions. I think it would be inappropriate to spell out precisely what circumstances might prevail that would cause me to use atomic weapons. The only general resonse I can give is that if I was convinced that the security or existence of our own nation was threatened, under those circumstances I would use atomic weapons.

"If there was a massive invasion in Europe by the Soviet Union, I think the likelihood would be that atomic weapons would be used. My own belief is that limited nuclear war would be unlikely. I have read some of the statements made by Soviet leaders, and I think their commitment to limited nuclear war is very doubtful.

"We have predicated a lot on our new weaponry acquisition on the premise that we need to have both first-strike and retaliatory capability with a presumption that massive strategic attacks on population centers would not follow. That certainly is a possibility, but I think a doubtful one.

"Pre-emptive strike, again, would only be used, to keep my answer deliberately in very general terms, if I was convinced that the existence or the security of our nation was threatened."

The July 27 Red Star, the Soviet Army paper carried a Tass news agency dispatch which reported on a U.S. press interview with "Democratic Presidential candidate J. Carter:"

... answering a question about his opinion concerning the possible launching of a U.S. first strike with strategic or tactical nuclear weapons, J. Carter stated that he does not exclude the

possibility, but only under one condition — if circumstances should arise which threaten the security of the United States or its very existence."

Exclusive Interview

State Department Advisor: "First Strike Should Only Be Used In Retaliation!?"

July 30 (NSIPS) — The following interview with Barry Blechman of the Brookings Institution, a State Department advisor, was conducted two days ago by a reporter friendly with NSIPS, and who passed it on to us.

Q. Mr. Blechman, what is your reaction to Jimmy Carter's recent statement that he would utilize a NATO "first strike" thermonuclear capability against the Warsaw pact? The statement was reported in the Washington Post, and attacked strongly by the Soviet Union in their party paper, Pravda.

Blechman: Well, let me see. It was maybe 1974-75 — I cannot remember but, anyway about two years ago — (Former Secretary of Defense James) Schlesinger and even President Ford made statements on "first strike" with nuclear weapons. The reasons are clear. Vietnam was falling apart and the U.S. has to reassure the Koreans when that sort of thing happens. And part of the statement refers to that. This is what Carter was getting at.

Q: Well, then under certain conditions, Carter is for a nuclear first-strike?

Blechman: Actually most of the advisors were and are against this view, and were for more conventional weapons. Oh no, Carter is not for first-strike. In fact, the way the Washington Post reports it, Carter is opposed to it. Where did you see this statement?

Q: It was in the Post, and in Pravda.

Blechman: Yes, well, the promise is that you can fight a limited nuclear war, but shouldn't rely on first-strike. It's very difficult and Carter is more for conventional weapons trying to keep a favorable balance. First-strike must be used for security retaliatory use (sic); they can devastate any country and should be used as a deterrent.

Q: First-strike in retaliation?? I'm not sure I get that. In any case, given Soviet first-strike capabilities, it seems the U.S. wouldn't stand a chance.

Blechman: (laughing) No, we wouldn't. But the second-strike is what bothe the U.S. and the Soviets accept.

Q: Well, isn't all this talk of first and second strike, like Carter's statement, pretty provocative for the Soviets?

Blechman: (laughing) Yes, indeed. A first-strike might be taken as a warning and a threat. But a second strike statement is not provacative. No matter what you're doing, it's not threatening at all.

Exclusive Translation

Revival Of War Hysteria In West German Press

July 29 (NSIPS) — The following press excerpts from the Federal Republic of Germany — a macabre throwback to 1944-45 myths about wonder weapons and "national spirit." an editorial calling for the food weapon to be used against the Warsaw Pact, and a fat Bavarian fascist's déjà-vu that this period reminds him of the middle 1930s again — are full confirmation that the FRG press is being unleashed by its Atlanticist masters to create the war propaganda that will lead to nuclear war with the Warsaw Pact by no later than 1977.

The first excerpt, taken from the July 29 Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, comes from an article by Adelbert Weinstein, a former Major on the World War II Nazi General Staff, presently specializing in NATO and military affairs. Any "good German" reporter who ever got a midnight call from Goebbels's Propaganda Ministry appreciates what Adelbert Weinstein went through when NATO Supreme Commander Alexander