

## **How to contain the U.S.A?**

I want to mention a more principle thought in the beginning. The tradition of anti-imperialist theory and practice always had a strong interventionist notion. With the end of the Cold War we experience the rule of a small group of countries and institutions/organizations, which totally dominate politics and public opinion. Positions and thoughts which might have been right during the previous period mean something different nowadays. For example, today 'intervening to prevent human rights violations' simply means to justify the interventions and aggressions of the Great Powers to secure or extend their control in their 'areas of responsibility'.

A curious phenomena and quite disturbing is the stance of many peace groups and activists towards the proliferation of ABC-weapons and more advanced missile systems. It seems quite obvious that in order to promote peaceful solutions to conflicts we should stand up against the main aggressors who, not surprisingly, are the main military powers led by the U.S.A. Why do many of those vehemently oppose the proliferation of atomic bombs but don't do anything about the major arsenals? Why do those oppose C-weapons for Iraq but say nothing about the thousands of tons in possession of the Great Powers? Why do those accept Trident U-boats always ready to attack and destroy whole regions of the world but have a problem with Iraq trying to get access to at least a few medium range missiles?

## **The U.S.A. is the main promoter of instabilities and war**

The U.S.A. attack other countries frequently and with extreme cruelty. It is a country build on mass extermination, extreme exploitation and social barbarism. Since the end of the Cold War only, the U.S.A. militarily attacked or invaded several countries causing hundred thousands of deaths - Iraq, Somalia, Haiti, Sudan, Afghanistan, Yugoslavia and again Afghanistan. Wherever is war we can be quite sure the U.S.A. are directly or covertly involved in fuelling conflict. Columbia, Congo, Palestine - the list can be extended easily.

The U.N. is dominated by the Great Powers who define its role largely as part of the propaganda apparatus selling the wars to the people. Most people in the attacking countries don't really care, at least as long as they aren't negatively affected personally.

## **The Peace movement is unable to stop further aggression**

We didn't see any serious action against NATO or the Pentagon coming from peace organizations. There was always some grassroots protest. But the peace movement proved to be unable to stop any of the attacks and provide no protection whatsoever for the attacked.

We organize, demonstrate and educate for peace but aren't in any way successful. We are neither fully committed nor powerful enough to stop the imperialist war machine. That leads to a serious problem. Countries are being attacked or threatened with attacks and can't defend themselves against a far superior enemy. Few are standing in solidarity with the attacked and many of those with mixed motivations and intentions.

The question is, how can weaker countries prevent to be attacked by the Great Powers particularly the U.S.A.? What can they do to make further attacks less likely? How can the U.S.A. be contained from using its military to enforce its will upon weaker countries?

## **Deterrence through a credible threat of retaliation**

A known approach and proven to have some success is to build up a potential for serious and credible retaliation. The strategy is to give up on competing with the superior adversary where it is out of reach or sense but concentrate instead on preventing military conflict through deterrence. Unable to win or defend itself a country can at least make the calculation of the aggressor very difficult. There won't be any gradual and controlled escalation, which can only favor the superior forces, but the danger of a quick escalation into the level of strategic nuclear forces. Eventually a desperate country will press the buttons and strike back causing tens or even hundreds of thousands of casualties. It's about deterrence through credible threats of retaliation. It won't be MAD but something not too far from it to completely lose its convincing power.

## **The case for proliferation of missiles and atomic bombs**

A critical mass of medium or long range ballistic missiles equipped with nuclear or chemical warheads could eventually provide a certain level of deterrence against the aggressions and attacks of hegemonial powers with far superior military forces. This is especially so given the ineffectiveness of ABM defense. It will take a long time and plenty of resources to substantially increase the accuracy of ABM systems.

It is obvious and easy to understand. The ability and preparedness to retaliate will give these countries some level of protection. And it is first and foremost very cynical for peace groups and activists to side with the Great Powers in preventing the proliferation of ICBMs and MRBMs and atomic bombs. They effectively don't serve peace but the continuation of dominance through military superiority. Parts of the human rights and peace movement are in essence simply on the side of the oppressors. An important add-on to the main propaganda line.

It is common to be against the Iraqi sovereignty to decide about their own military requirements and strategy. There is no question that Iraq has to deal with a very difficult security landscape and is threatened by intervention and attack from neighbors and foreign powers alike. There are strong arguments that a militarily strong Iraq with a nuclear capability would be an important stabilizing factor for the region as a whole. But stability in the Middle East can't be in the interest of the U.S.A. and its main regional ally Israel.

## **Don't help to protect the status quo**

There is only one reason why a few countries should be allowed to have all kinds of weapons while others not. The reason is acceptance of the status quo of domination by the Totalitarian Societies.

Everything comes down to a very simple conclusion: the Pentagon and MIC are the main promoters of instability and wars in the world today. U.S.A. and peace is as contradictory as capitalism and economic justice. It just doesn't fit. The U.S.A. is the main enemy of all peace loving people.

**Abbreviations:**

ABC-weapons: Atomic, biological and chemical weapons

ABM: Anti Ballistic Missile

ICBM: Inter Continental Ballistic Missile

MAD: Mutual Assured Destruction

Whoever attacks will also end up destroyed.

MIC: Military Industrial Complex

MRBM: Medium Range Ballistic Missile

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization