

Obama's Utopian War Madness

by Carl Osgood

June 12—Over recent months, there has been a growing chorus of warnings that the world is on the precipice of nuclear war, a war that will result in the end of human civilization. As part of that chorus, there has been an increasing exposure of the insane utopians whose theories dictate how nuclear weapons are to be used. The problem with these exposés, however, is that they assume that it is the utopians who are behind the danger, when it is in fact the collapse of the British imperial system of financier looting, a system of which President Obama is a willing asset, that is fueling the drive toward war.

As early as 1990, when the Berlin Wall had fallen and the Communist East Bloc was disintegrating, Lyndon LaRouche, from his jail cell in Rochester, Minnesota, was warning that it was not just the East Bloc that was collapsing, but that the West was also collapsing. The Soviet crisis, LaRouche said in a Nov. 9, 1989 statement, was being accelerated by the collapse of the economy in the West, “especially the economies of the United Kingdom and of the United States, which contrary to all the talk about the boom in the United States, have been collapsing at varying rates, generally now accelerating since about 1970-71 with the events of that period.”

LaRouche responded to the Soviet collapse with the “Paris-Berlin-Vienna Productive Triangle” policy, based on using that region, then still heavily industrialized, as a locomotive for world development. This was not, however, just an economic recovery policy, but also a war avoidance intervention.

“We are now at a point that, unless the railroad program, the Triangle Program, which we have specified for Central Europe, is implemented, we will have an international disaster,” LaRouche said in February of 1990.



EIR video grab

In a 1999 video, LaRouche warned that British Empire-directed mercenaries, posing as Islamic, would ignite conflicts that would prevent collaboration of the Strategic Triangle nations, and ultimately lead to nuclear war.

“We might even have a new world war, erupting in the next couple of years, as a result of a failure to implement the Railroad Triangle program.” Instead of heeding LaRouche’s warning, the George H.W. Bush Administration and the successive Tory governments in the Britain of Margaret Thatcher and John Major chose a different path, one of economic looting of the former Soviet bloc and expanding wars in the Balkans and the Middle East.

In 1999, LaRouche forecast where we would soon be if that policy direction were not changed—in fact, where we are now—in his *Storm Over Asia* video. The threat LaRouche identified was that of generalized global war not only against Russia, but also against Iran, China, and India.

“If these nations are pushed to the wall by a continuing escalation of a war which is modeled on the wars which the British ran against Russia, China, and so



kremlin.ru

Russian President Vladimir Putin (left) and China President Xi Jinping at Russian-Chinese talks on Sept. 3, 2015 in Beijing.

forth, during the Nineteenth Century and early Twentieth Century, this will lead to the point that Russia has to make the decision to accept the disintegration of Russia as a nation, or to resort to the means it has, to exact terrible penalties on those who are attacking it, going closer and closer to the source, the forces behind the mercenaries—which include, of course, Turkey, which is a prime NATO asset being used as a cover for much of this mercenary operation [that is, the terrorist wars that were then being run against Russia] in the North Caucasus and in Central Asia,” LaRouche said.

Russia chose not to disintegrate, and under the leadership of President Vladimir Putin, has built up its capacity to resist. China has, in a similar fashion, built up its economy together with Russia and other nations, and is now offering the world its Silk Road policy—in effect, LaRouche’s Land Bridge policy, first articulated in the mid-1990s—as humanity’s alternative to economic collapse and nuclear war. The Anglo-American Empire, desperate to save itself from near-term extinction, has nothing left to offer except its insane utopian nuclear war strategy.

Insanity of ‘Escalate to De-Escalate’

In 1983, neocon agents in the Reagan Administration ran a war game called “Proud Prophet,” which was “a large scale, interactive, politico-military game which involved more than 200 people for 12 days of actual game play stretched out over seven weeks,” according to the highly redacted, after-action report produced by

the National Defense University in early 1984. What made the game unusual was that it involved actual decision-makers, including Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. John Vessey. The roughly 200 participants were from a laundry list of U.S. government agencies and U.S. military commands around the world.

According to author and Defense Department advisor Paul Bracken, who has apparently written the most authoritative account of Proud Prophet so far, the war game involved actual U.S. war plans, making it “the most realistic

exercise involving nuclear weapons ever played by the U.S. government during the Cold War.”

The result? “Many of the strategic concepts proposed to deal with the Soviet Union were revealed to be either irresponsible or totally incompatible with current U.S. capabilities and immediately thrown out,” Bracken writes. One of those concepts was the idea of de-escalatory nuclear strikes, the idea being that if the Soviets saw that NATO would go nuclear early, then they would back down and “come to their senses.” But that is not what happened in the game.

“The Soviet Union team interpreted the nuclear strikes as an attack on their nation, their way of life, and their honor,” Bracken writes. “So they responded with an enormous nuclear salvo at the United States.” The United States retaliated in kind, and pretty soon there was nothing left of the world. “This game went nuclear big time, not because Secretary Weinberger and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs were crazy, but because they faithfully implemented the prevailing U.S. strategy,” Bracken reports. The results of the game must have been particularly scary for President Ronald Reagan. “A nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought,” Reagan said in a subsequent State of the Union address.

Geoff Wilson and Will Saetren, both of the Ploughshares Fund anti-nuclear advocacy group, in a May 27 article in *The National Interest*, use the Bracken account of Proud Prophet to warn that the concept of nuclear de-escalation is today part of NATO planning, but it is just as insane now as it was then. The implication of Wilson

and Saetren's argument is that Russia, today, would likely react the same way, resulting in a nuclear escalation that ends with massive nuclear exchanges, resulting in the end of the world. "The notion that nuclear weapons can be used for anything 'beyond deterrence' is reckless and dangerous thinking. It is an option that should be taken off the table entirely," they conclude.

This is the warning, in fact, that was issued by former Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. James Cartwright and retired Russian General Valdimir Dvorkin in an op-ed in the *New York Times* in April 2015. They also warned of the continued risk of a launch-on-warning operational posture. Cartwright's activities mark the revival of a long-standing fight between insane utopians, and sane military commanders engaged in active war avoidance today.

Irrationality of the SIOP

Numerous changes were made to U.S. nuclear strategy following Proud Prophet, but an underlying irrationality must have remained. In early 1991, Gen. George Lee Butler, who had just taken command of the U.S. Air Force's Strategic Air Command, asked to see the SIOP, the Single Integrated Operational Plan—the plan for waging global thermonuclear war against the Soviet Union. Author Eric Schlosser, in his book *Command and Control*, reports that Butler examined every single target in the SIOP, scrutinizing thousands of ground-zeros. What he found—and he was hardly naive, having spent much of his career in the nuclear business—astonished him. Bridges and rail-



Stevens Institute of Technology/youtube

The Proud Prophet war game in 1983, which used actual U.S. war plans, demonstrated that most of the U.S. nuclear war fighting concepts were wrong, according to a report by Paul Bracken (above).

roads in the middle of nowhere were targeted with dozens of warheads. Moscow itself was targeted with hundreds of warheads, including dozens of them aimed at a single radar station.

"With the possible exception of the Soviet nuclear war plan, this was the single most absurd and irresponsible document I had ever reviewed in my life," Butler later said, according to Schlosser. "I came to fully appreciate the truth . . . we escaped the Cold War without a nuclear holocaust by some combination of skill, luck, and divine intervention, and I suspect the latter in greatest proportion."

Butler traveled a road rare for such a high ranking military officer. He went from being responsible for waging a nuclear war to being an advocate for the abolition of nuclear weapons. Despite the rhetoric from President Obama about a world free of nuclear weapons, Butler is not much more sanguine about our

chances today than he was in the 1990s. Nuclear war, of the kind he trained and planned for while in uniform, could still happen, Butler believes, because U.S. officials remain in the grip of the delusion that nuclear deterrence is an effective and safe policy.

In a May 27, 2016 profile published in *Politico*, Butler said that nuclear weapons policy making remains under the control of "a relatively small cadre of theorists and strategists who speak with great assurance and authority" but remain stuck "in the apocalyptic vocabulary of nuclear deterrence [and] worlds which spiral toward chaos." Deterrence, he says, is a "crutch that led to the expenditure of trillions of dollars" while "we ignored, discounted, or dismissed



USAF

After General George Lee Butler (above) took command of the U.S. Air Force's Strategic Command in 1991, he characterized U.S. nuclear war plans as "absurd and irresponsible."

its flaws.” He is particularly critical of the Obama Administration’s policy of confrontation with Russia, which he believes has sacrificed opportunities for further reductions in nuclear weapons.

President Obama’s stated commitment to denuclearization is completely fraudulent. Not only is he committed to the most expensive nuclear modernization program in U.S. history, but the rate of dismantling of nuclear warheads under his presidency has slowed to its lowest level since President John F. Kennedy. The Federation of American Scientists’ Hans Kristensen reported in a May 26, 2016 blog posting—just as Obama was heading to Hiroshima, Japan—that the Obama Administration dismantled only 109 warheads in 2015, and that the administration dismantled the fewest warheads, as a proportion of the total stockpile, of any of the last three administrations.

The modernization program, in fact, includes weapons—the B61-12 nuclear gravity bomb and the Long Range Standoff cruise missile—that have been criticized as making nuclear weapons “more usable,” in the words of General Cartwright. Both weapons are described as giving the president “more options” for their use, as opposed to large megatonnage strategic weapons that can only be used to destroy cities. “More options” means a greater temptation to use them—as in the case with the Euromissiles crisis of the 1980s—blurring the lines between conventional and nuclear war, all under “nuclear disarmament Nobel Peace Prize winning” President Obama.

Threat Inflation

Many top U.S. military officers have allowed themselves to be used to hype a non-existent Russian threat to the United States, as an “oh so clever” way to try to preserve their budgets.

The U.S. Army is feeling the budget pinch particularly hard, as it has shrunk from a post-9/11 high of 580,000 troops to 450,000, and may yet decline to 420,000. This shrinkage is occurring even as the Obama Administration is ramping up its confrontation and war threats against Russia.

These developments seem to be causing two contrary reactions in the Pentagon. One, not often reported, is to question the demonization of Russia in the first place,—while the other is to fly into panic mode and inflate the threat to persuade the U.S. Congress to jack up military spending. In a May 12 article in *Politico*, author Mark Perry recalled the April 5 testimony before

the Senate Armed Services Committee of a panel of Army officers led by Lt. Gen. H.R. McMaster, the director of the U.S. Army Capabilities and Integration Center and widely regarded as one of the smartest men in the Army, in which the panel claimed that the Army is now in danger of being “outranged and outgunned” in the next war (which could only be against Russia and/or China) and that the Army is in danger of becoming “too small to secure the nation.”

While the written testimony submitted by the panel seems to have been a consensus document among senior Army officers, not everybody, as Perry writes, was buying it. “This is the ‘Chicken-Little, sky-is-falling’ set in the Army,” a senior Pentagon officer told him. “These guys want us to believe the Russians are ten feet tall. There’s a simpler explanation: The Army is looking for a purpose, and a bigger chunk of the budget. And the best way to get that is to paint the Russians as being able to land in our rear and on both of our flanks at the same time [a reference to Gen. Grant’s comment during the Battle of the Wilderness in 1864]. What a crock.”

The reality is that the U.S. defense budget—when overseas contingency operations, the Department of Energy’s portion of the nuclear weapons budget, and other ancillary war functions such as intelligence and homeland security are included—is close to \$1 trillion a year. The Russian defense budget, in contrast, is a mere \$84 billion. The numbers just don’t add up the way those who are inflating the threat claim they do, to get a bigger budget.

Retired Army Colonel Douglas Macgregor, a fierce critic of the way the Army thinks, also blasted the McMaster testimony and those who say the Army needs a bigger budget to better protect the common soldier. “If the generals actually gave a damn about the soldiers, the last fifteen years would have been totally different,” he wrote to Perry. “What happened to the thousands of lives and trillions of dollars squandered in Iraq and Afghanistan? What happened to the billions lost in a series of failed modernization programs since 1991?”

Indeed. If the generals who adapted to the geopolitical paradigm of perpetual warfare after 9/11, had instead told the truth as best they understood it, perhaps the series of disasters beginning with the attack on Afghanistan in October 2001, and the invasion of Iraq in March 2003 might have been avoided. That would have been the best defense of the United States they could have offered and a true adherence to their oaths as commissioned officers.