

Top Brass Hoodwinked By New CSIS Fraud

by Tony Papert

The CSIS Europe and International Security Programs, in partnership with the Noaber Foundation, hosted on Jan. 10, the launch of “Towards a Grand Strategy for an Uncertain World: Renewing the Transatlantic Partnership,” under the signatures of some of the most respected retired military leaders of the United States and Western Europe.

Last November, LaRouche PAC exposed the fraud of the CSIS (Center for Strategic and International Studies) report, “Alternative Futures for Russia,” in which a provocative script of assassinations, dictatorship, and executions in Russia was smuggled into a collation of expert forecasts.

Now, CSIS has produced a hoax which is far more crooked. While the names of U.S. Gen. John Shalikashvili; Gen. Dr. Klaus Naumann of Germany; Gen. Henk van den Breemen of Holland; Britain’s Field Marshall The Lord Inge; and French Adm. Jacques Lanxade are featured, these grey-bearded generals are nothing but simple victims of a hoax. The actual authors of the 155-page report are a mating pair of twenty-something “Strangeloves”; far-out neo-conservatives Douglas Murray of Britain, and Benjamin Bilski of the Netherlands. Murray’s first book was a biography of Oscar Wilde’s homosexual lover; his latest is *Neo-Conservatism: Why We Need It*. Both authors belong to the Muslim-baiting school recently made infamous by the blasphemous “Danish cartoons.” Murray, born 1979, is



Douglas Murray

a frequent confederate, in these outrages, of David Horowitz, who runs a right-wing campus witchhunt on behalf of Bush-Cheney policies. His British website, Center for Social Cohesion,” mimicks Horowitz’s Muslim-baiting in the U.S., and reportedly wants to halt all immigration of Muslims into Europe.

Bilski, for his part, sponsors and translates anti-Muslim blasphemies by the Iranian émigré Afshin Ellian. His specialty at the University of Leiden, where he teaches, is “Social Cohesion and the Role of the Right.”

Both young military-strategic gurus are completely innocent of any military or strategic experience. They are also obviously very well-acquainted with each other: sort of the “Cohn and Shine” of the McCarthy era.

Call for Pre-Emptive Nuclear Strikes

Under the misused names of these top generals, Bilski and Murray call on NATO to be prepared to launch pre-emptive nuclear attacks to prevent use of weapons of mass destruction by its enemies. They call first-strike use of nuclear weapons an “indispensable instrument” as part of an overall “grand strategy” to deal with the current dangerous world. Key to that “grand strategy” is inducing uncertainty in the mind of the enemy, so that he has no idea what to expect. “Nuclear escalation is the ultimate step in responding asymmetrically, and at the same time the most powerful way of inducing uncertainty in an opponent’s mind.” Then in language reminiscent of Richard Nixon’s “madman theory,” they declare that “unpredictability is an important element of any strategy that aims at conflict prevention and termination. Opponents must never know which step could be the next one, and must never have a chance to rule out any of the options in their opponent’s arsenal.”

The duo writes that the “risk of further proliferation is imminent and, with it, the danger that nuclear war fighting, albeit limited in scope, might become possible. The first use of nuclear weapons must remain in the quiver of escalation as the ultimate instrument to prevent the use of weapons of mass destruction.” Due to the spread of nuclear technology, there is “simply no realistic prospect of a nuclear-free world.” They call for allowing the use of force without UN Security Council authorization when “immediate action is needed to protect large numbers of human beings.”

They want a large-scale reform of NATO and a new pact among NATO, the U.S., and the EU to sanction such action.

According to British press reports, this hoax has been presented at the Pentagon and to NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer. They even claim it will likely be on the agenda of the NATO summit in Bucharest in April.

In addition to the usual neocon drivel about “Islamist terrorism,” the two also include a huge freakout about China in Africa. They complain that China’s willingness to invest in and give aid to African countries is “detrimental” to “good governance.”