



**ON THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN
STRATEGY AND TACTICS**

A cursory visit into George Friedman's Private Intelligence.

By Pierre Beaudry, February 20, 2014

This is a cursory evaluation of some of the best intelligence reports of George Friedman, CEO of the private intelligence corporation, [STRATFOR](#). The following seven sections have a single purpose, which is to force you to think about the future by remembering four terribly shadowy dates of the past: July 25, 1914, July 28, 1914, July 31, 1914, and August 4, 1914. Why? Because your life depends on it.

1. THE CELTIC GOD TARANIS BLINDSPOT: THE DRONE-VAMPIRE OF ECONOMICS
2. THE "GEOPOLITICAL" SIGNIFICANCE OF MOLDOVA AND UKRAINE
3. GEORGE FRIEDMAN'S SECRET WAR AND HIS UNFOLDING MACBETH SCENARIO
4. THE BRITISH STRATEGIC METHOD OF FANATIZATION AND VICTIMIZATION
5. AN APPETITE FOR DECIPHERING WHAT DOESN'T MAKE ANY SENSE AT ALL
6. WHAT IT MEANS FOR UKRAINE TO LIVE ON THE EDGE
7. THE AMERICAN WAR PLAN RED AGAINST GREAT BRITAIN

INTRODUCTION

*"Heretofore, the customary view of reality among us,
Has tended to be the deductive method:
Deductions from the experience of past and present.
This has been an error: a stubborn error, in fact.
Our mission lies in the pre-shaping of the future."*

Lyndon LaRouche Memorandum, THE FUTURE AS SUBJECT, 2/14/2014

According to political scientist and CEO of the private intelligence corporation, [STRATFOR](#) George Friedman, the current American strategic situation with Al Qaeda is captive of a secret and invisible war which must be made visible to those who are insightful and capable of preventing the unthinkable. The interesting view of Friedman is that, although he doesn't have the quality of Lyn's investigative method of rapier and bludgeon, he, nonetheless, thinks strategically and not tactically; that is to say, he is forecasting from the vantage point of peace, and that is why he has been able to be fairly accurate about certain aspects of American military deployments.

Last May Friedman noted about a [STRATFOR](#) assessment of a US military intervention in Syria: "The United States, with its European allies, does not have the force needed to end Syria's bloodshed. If it tried, it would merely be held responsible for the bloodshed without achieving any strategic goal." (Quoted in Lyndon LaRouche's [Opposition to a Syrian Adventure is Escalating](#), LaRouchePAC, May 3, 2013) The question that I am asking about Friedman's outlook is the following: Does his evaluation about Syria also apply to the present situation in Ukraine?

If strategy is the science of peace, that is to say, the science of how the whole of humanity can progress to the next step of its development as a whole, then, what is the ingredient that human beings must have in order not to repeat the stupidity of previous wars, especially World War I? What is the difference between strategy and tactics? This is what I will try to identify with Friedman's insights into the Ukraine situation and the Al Qaeda War. But first, let's have a quick look into the fallacy of the British outlook on war.

1. THE CELTIC GOD TARANIS BLINDSPOT: THE DRONE-VAMPIRE OF ECONOMICS.

"It's the future which determines the past, not the past which determines the future."

Dehors Debonneheure

Named after the Celtic god of thunder, Taranis, the Unmanned Combat Air Vehicle (UCAV) produced by BAE in 2010, represents the future of British wars based on the tactical advantage of being able to strike an enemy at long range and with hypersonic speed from their proverbial WC. This is the true British version of Cabinet Warfare (WC) that the British military is offering to the world in the name of Her Majesty, and which is able to wage war from one's home, without taking the risk of being killed. Some think this is the future of warfare, a few others think it is stupid to the utmost for reasons that will become apparent in the following pages of this report. The key is to look for what is not there.

It is the significance of this blind spot of British Taranis, better understood as "Tyrannis", which is important to understand here, as the weak flank of warfare. Compare Taranis simply with the idea of *trading for money*, and you will understand why this drone is an impotent Vampire of War.

British free-trade money is a substitute for the process of economic productivity: a financial drone. Money has been a monetary substitute for the productive powers of the human mind, a substitute shadow of sense perception projecting an image of value for itself. Thus, money becomes the drone-

vampire sucking the blood of economic life. As Lyn showed, Alexander Hamilton corrected that fake identity by restoring money to its rightful function of credit: “Trading money for money, the customary British practice, for example, is merely usury, not creativity. It is only in the process of production that the role of money can achieve its proper purpose for society. Hamilton’s notion of the function of credit achieves that required function of money in the economic process. It is productivity as such, which is the only realization of a value for money.” (Lyndon LaRouche, Note on Hamilton for *THE FUTURE AS A SUBJECT*, 2/14/2014)



Figure 1 The British Ministry of Defense (MoD) prototype Taranis, Unmanned Combat Air Vehicle (UCAV) produced by BAE. Welcome to the new justice executioner of the British oligarchy. (British Brain operative, [Film Director & Author CHRIS EVERARD](#))

The fact that drone technology has greatly reduced the risk of losing a pilot’s life in flying an airplane has become the most important aspect of British Cabinet Warfare. According to BBC, the advance in air control technology changes completely the strategic nature of warfare as it is known today. As BBC reported on July 12, 2010, “The issue of "writing the pilot" out of the aircraft equation has long been a controversial topic, more so since the first Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) went into active service.” (Daniel Emery, [MoD lifts lid on unmanned combat plane prototype](#), BBC News) The new problem this innovation poses, however, merely comes from an excessive crowdedness of British WC. The serious problem it poses, however, is that the pilot of the drone is a mad man, like the one we have in

the White House today. Why? Because by taking the pilot out of the cockpit, the British have also taken the mind out of the pilot. (Figure 2)



Figure 2 Her Majesty's New judge, Jury, & Executioner, I Have Drone Obama. (British Brain operative, [Film Director & Author CHRIS EVERARD](#))

What is scary about the unmanned Taranis concept is not so much the ability to control war at a great distance by remote control, but to wage war from the vantage point of madness; that is, by attempting to maintain life on Earth based on the economics of death. A drone is a great idea for a toy, but when grownups are convinced they can win wars with similar devices, it makes you wonder if those drones are not also unminded. The point is that such an advance in military technology tends to blind war mongers from understanding that a defense against such new devices is already well known. It is called the human mind. The irony, here, is that British "brains" don't express mind but misfits. Such drone projects are already obsolete, even before they go into a production line, because behind this kind of war-game technology, it is peace which represents the superior concept in war.

There are many reasons why the Taranis wet dream of a British Military brain is not going to work, and the main one is that you cannot win the peace with grownups playing war games with drone toys. The British military would probably reply to this: "We don't care; we don't want to win wars. We just want to kill." And, the reason the British want to have wars to go on forever is because Her Majesty is committed to the design of eliminating 6 billion people from this planet. The only reason why the poor

British people don't understand this is because they refuse to acknowledge that their oligarchical government is thinking the impossible, and their subjects are not. In other words, the British refuse to ask the question: "What if we were wrong?"

The truth of the matter is to understand that wars are not won by superior weapons based on any advantage such as [Prompt Global Strike](#), because the discovery of a superior defense against newly discovered offensive weapons demonstrates that peace is the superior concept in war. This is why, for example, the LaRouche Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) offered to the Soviet Union by President Ronald Reagan, on November 23rd, 1984, was a superior defensive concept that made ICBMs and nuclear war obsolete. As the LaRouche doctrine demonstrates, by the power of reason alone, war against war is superior in nature to war itself, because human beings are not animals. Unfortunately, the Soviet Command of the 1980's was unable to recognize this fine paradox and rejected the LaRouche proposal. Therefore, the world is now facing the danger of nuclear war, one more time, with a [New Cuban Missile Crisis](#).

The thing to remember, here, is that when the intention of what you say is also the result of what you preach, it means that you have entered into a future cycle which is capable of changing war into peace by time reversal. However, this can only happen provided you are anchored from the stars, so to speak, because this works only from the top down. This means that the pathway that you follow always traces your way back from a measure of time reversal, which is never the same and which improves the future by changing the past, each time you change someone, because the measure of change changes with you, at the same time that it takes you back to a future past that is no longer what it used to be.

That's the geometry of change inside of the triply-connected manifold of your mind. And, the irony is that whatever you measure can never be done mathematically as a quantity. It can never be quantized, because quantity is not the measure. Change is the measure, and time reversal is the measure of change. Lyn has been developing this principle with Shakespearian dramatic poetry, which is the same as changing from an arithmetical idea of electromagnetism to the musical Lydian principle of composition of Bach. As Lyn articulated it:

"That's the basis of going from arithmetic to the principles of Bach. The Bach structure is the same thing: In other words, you're living within a structured universe. And what happens is, when people get away from Bach, and go into popular music, they lose their minds. That is, they lose the ability to think clearly, because all creative thought, is coherent with musical composition, the Bach principle. And you just apply it. That's what the resonance of Mozart is, of Brahms, and Beethoven: It's all based on that! That conception." (Lyndon LaRouche, LaRouchePAC [New Paradigm for Mankind Weekly Report, Wednesday, February 5, 2014](#))

An example of this is the process of transforming Helium-III into an industrial fusion revolution on the Moon. It would be fascinating to discover how to describe this performative process as does an actual Bach fugue inside of your mind. Simply think of how intervals transform from one another based on the Lydian principle of change between three conflicting elements. However, so far, no one outside of Lyn has been able to demonstrate how such a process works in any satisfactory performative way; that is to say, by changing the reader on the spot, as a good musical performance of the actual Bach fugue does.

Let's see, then, how one can apply the same principle to changing the present strategic situation in Ukraine. A cursory survey of George Friedman's intelligence reports will help us do that.

2. THE "GEOPOLITICAL" SIGNIFICANCE OF MOLDOVA.

"In school, many of us learned the poem Invictus. It concludes with the line, "I am the master of my fate, I am the captain of my soul." This is a line that a Victorian gentleman might bequeath to an American businessman. It is not a line that resonates in Romania. Nothing in their history tells Romanians that they rule their fate or dominate their soul. Everything in their history is a lesson in how fate masters them or how their very soul is a captive of history. As a nation, Romanians have modest hopes and expectations tempered by their past."

[Geopolitical Journey with George Friedman](#)

According to Friedman: "Ukraine is Russia's southwestern anchor and its Achilles' heel. It is difficult for Russia to be secure without Ukraine both for economic and strategic reasons. Russia would be hard to defend if Ukraine were under the control of a hostile power. What Ukraine is to Russia, Moldova is to Ukraine. It is a salient that makes Ukraine difficult to defend, and if Ukraine can't be defended Russia can't be defended either." (George Friedman, [Geopolitical Journey, Part 4: Moldova](#), November 19, 2010)

The reason why Friedman considers Moldova of "geopolitical" significance is that he believes, as Stalin did when Hitler invaded Poland in 1939, that a Russian control of that region increased the security of Ukraine and, at the same time, increased the vulnerability of the Danube basin. As Friedman put it: "As obscure as it was to the rest of the world, Bessarabia [Moldova] became a key piece on the chessboard between Hitler and Stalin, just as the Russian and Ottoman empires had sought after it before. Places that are of little interest to the rest of the world can be of great importance to great powers." (George Friedman, [Geopolitical Journey, Part 4: Moldova](#), November 19, 2010)

This brings me to the point that I wanted to make, and which is that it is essential that Americans understand the significance of Russian strategy. When the 2010 Ukrainian elections brought into power a "pro-Russian" government, under President Victor Yanukovich, it became clear that Moldova had to become to Ukraine what Ukraine had been to Russia, historically. In other words, what is implied in Friedman's warning is that if anyone were to disturb that delicate "geopolitical" balance of power, the world could be headed for World War III. This is the basis for his forecasting. As Friedman put it: "Consequently, Moldova began to shift from being a piece of land between two rivers to being a strategic asset for both the Russians and any Western entity that might wish to contain or threaten Ukraine and therefore Russia." (George Friedman, [Geopolitical Journey, Part 4: Moldova](#), November 19, 2010) That's

the point to understand in strategy, because the last tilt in the balance leading to war can also be tilted rapidly toward peace.

What Friedman warned about Moldova in 2010 is happening now in Ukraine. On February 10, 2014, former government official and current head of the Russian Academy of Geopolitical studies, General Leonid Ivashov, issued the following starkest warning to the European Union and to the United States:

“Apparently they [officials of the European Union and U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry] have dedicated themselves, and continue to do so, too deeply and thoroughly studying the doctrine of Dr. Goebbels. . . They present everything backwards from reality. It is one of the formulas which Nazi propaganda employed most successfully: ... They accuse the party that is defending itself, of aggression. What we are seeing in Ukraine and in Syria is a western project, a new kind of war: in both places you see a clear anti-Russian approach, and as is well known, wars today begin with psychological and information warfare operations. . .

"I assume that the Foreign Ministry understands that we are at war, and that wars have their laws. . . After the information war, they are preparing a land and sea [intervention] in Ukraine. Kerry and Obama are encouraging in Kiev what they harshly repress in their country. European leaders break up unauthorized demonstrations with hoses, throwing demonstrators in jail, while in the Ukrainian case they do the exact opposite, and on top of that, they threaten Russia. Logically, this is part of information warfare.

"Keep in mind that, under the cover of information commotion, U.S. ships are entering the Black Sea, that is, near Ukraine. They are sending marines, and they have also begun to deploy more tanks in Europe. . . After the information war, they are preparing for an operation by land and sea. Possibly also by air.

"The scenario could be the following: drive Ukraine to the breaking point, blame Yanukovich and Russia for everything, to then say that NATO can't simply sit by as a mere spectator, and then send its troops into to return order. Then a transitional government would be formed, as happened in Iraq and Kosovo, and NATO would take control of everything. Historical experience shows we have lived through similar situations. But before that they will need to justify the aggression with information warfare. . .

"They haven't even taught [opposition leaders] Klitchko, Yatsenyuk and Tyahnybok to run a government efficiently. The main thing is for them to take power, and destroy the Ukrainian state." (Russia's Gen. Ivashov: "[I Assume that the Foreign Ministry Understands We Are at War,](#)" LaRouchePAC, February 11, 2014)

Therefore, the “geopolitical” significance of Moldova and Ukraine is clear. Then, my question is: If this is the truth of the matter, why is the U.S. Government not responding to Friedman’s heads up about Ukraine? The Ukrainian ports of Odessa and Sevastopol, for example, which the Russians depend on for

their safety, can easily become NATO targets. It is obvious that the European Union move to integrate Ukraine into NATO has nothing to do with Ukraine, but is aimed at eliminating the second strike capability of Russia by deploying American ICBM's on Ukrainian territory. In other words, the European Union operation in Ukraine is nothing but a provocation, because it is a known *causus belli* for Russia.

It is clear that a war tragedy is now taking place in Ukraine because, like Moldova, Ukraine happens to be located where world powers collide and such powers will tend to abuse the local populations for purposes foreign to them. The peoples living in those borderland regions should be given the chance to choose their own destiny and an explicit right to be protected from foreign imperial designs. It seems that Russia and Ukraine are the only sovereign nations in a position to respond positively to such a need. Thus, it becomes clear that anyone pushing NATO in that region of the world is a fool looking for thermonuclear World War III.



Figure 3 George Friedman touring the [BORDERLANDS](#) of Eurasia. ([Stratfor](#))

3. GEORGE FRIEDMAN'S SECRET WAR AND HIS UNFOLDING MACBETH SCENARIO

In his book, [AMERICA'S SECRET WAR](#), Friedman identified the irony of his task as an intelligence operative in a very interesting way. He first established that the significant part of the Al Qaeda War, which started with the terrorist attack of 9/11/2001, had to be hidden. What he meant was that it had to be hidden from sense perception, but not from an insightful mind that is looking for the truth. So, again, the key to understand his evaluations is to look for what is not there. As Friedman wrote in 2004:

“This book is called *America’s Secret War* not only because so much of the war is hidden. It is the nature of war that each side hide as much as can be hidden. The secrecy of this war goes deeper. More than in any other war, I have studied, the true reason for each side’s actions are hidden from view. If I look through the lens of public discourse, nothing makes very much sense. Actions seem unconnected to one another, leading nowhere, lacking meaning. In the words of Macbeth, it is ‘a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.’



“That is not how I view the last three years. In retrospect, sometimes we can see that the apparent chaos actually had a clear if deep order to it, an order sometimes not even apparent to the actors who, having said their lines and done their deeds, shuffle off the stage, unaware of the full meaning of what had happened. But it is my belief as well that if one fully understands the motives and reasoning of the players, it is possible to understand events while they are happening, or even before. The key is to understand the actors as they understand themselves and to understand the forces that drive and constrain them even better than they understand them.” (George Friedman, [*AMERICA’S SECRET WAR: INSIDE THE HIDDEN WORLDWIDE STRUGGLE BETWEEN AMERICA AND ITS ENEMIES*](#), Random House Inc., New York, 2004, page xii)

Figure 4 George Friedman, CEO and founder, [STRATFOR](#)

Friedman’s reference to Shakespeare is the key. And, he is right to emphasize the poetic principle of Shakespeare in *Macbeth*. All of the lies told about the Al Qaeda War were told by “idiots.” And the Americans swallowed those lies without investigating what the playwright had in mind and why this war was being imposed on them from the proverbial outside. They didn’t ask whose intention it was to have this war, or for whose benefit it was going to be fought in the end. They accepted the line that the British fed them. Once you understand that the most important aspect of what was missing in this war was the intention, then you realize that America’s enemy is not Al Qaeda but the stupidity of the American people itself being controlled from the outside by British intelligence.

Friedman let the tail of that cat stick out of the bag when he admitted: “Some would argue that it isn’t a war at all but an isolated act of terrorism that has been manufactured into a war.” ([AMERICA’S SECRET WAR](#), p. xi) Pull on the tail, and you will unravel the animal that was hiding in that bag. Friedman didn’t say what the animal was, he just provided you with something to pull on.

What you might discover, if you pull that tail right, is that the purpose of this Al Qaeda war was intentional and deliberate, and its real underlying purpose was to involve the United States into an imperial war of population reduction. And, the only way to accomplish that aim was to take the American people completely by surprise and induce them into a state of impotent rage. The question is: how could an entire educated population like the American people be so stupid and be deceived into having to go to war against an enemy they didn’t even know?

Like Friedman, I don't view the world in the way that the character Macbeth did, but in the way that Shakespeare wrote the play, *Macbeth*; by understanding the underlying fabric of what makes the players march to their tragic destiny without knowing who is pulling their string and for what ultimate purpose they are put into motion. And this is why I find that Friedman's books are very useful for elucidating the purpose of war, provided it is read from the vantage point of strategy and not from tactical advantage. As he said: "The closer you stand to an object, the less sense it makes. The closer you watch this war, the more incoherent it becomes. This book uses Stratfor's geopolitical method to step back from the events and see the order hidden within." ([AMERICA'S SECRET WAR](#), p. xiii) And, that is precisely where the difference between strategy and tactics is located. The intention of this war was meant to be incoherent and hidden by design.

Contrary to what Friedman believes, however, I am not looking at the world from the standpoint of "geopolitics," but from the standpoint of epistemology. The great fear of the United States should not be the "geopolitical" fear that the Russians might gain in supporting Iran, Syria, or even Saudi Arabia. The American fear should be the fear of the imperial design of Great Britain, for the greatest enemy of man has always been oligarchism and the greatest enemy of America has always been Great Britain. This is Friedman's blind spot in his "geopolitics." He thinks Great Britain is our ally, and this is where he makes his strategic mistake. It is such a misguided fear of the Russian boogiemer, induced into American minds by British intelligence for decades, which has now led us to the brink of nuclear war against both Russia and China.

I also disagree with Friedman on the question of his treatment of the key players in his Macbeth play. Friedman wrote: "This book treats Al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden as they are, skilled and dedicated men with a clear vision of how they want the world to look. It treats George W. Bush the same way. I understand that both views will be vigorously attacked by those who would wish to make each into monsters or idiots. They are neither. They are leaders, playing chess with the lives of others and the fate of the world. Fools and psychotics do not accumulate and hold such power." ([AMERICA'S SECRET WAR](#), p. xiii) This is wrong because players like bin Laden and Bush are precisely the fools who are being played by the British oligarchy.

The irony, however, is that America must today get out of the tragic box they have put themselves into, and stop looking at reality for what it is shaped for their perception, but as what it should be from the standpoint of the principle of reason. America has to shift the balance of power decisively against the British Empire and in favor of Russia and China, if it wishes to survive. It may not do it, but this is what must be done. And that is why the hard choice is between going down with the British Empire and its free-trade collapse or getting rid of Obama and developing the future of the whole of mankind in alliance with Russia and China. As Lyn suggested, what the world needs is a Federation of Sovereign Nations. That is what is implied in the Russian Federation. That is the paradox that America faces today and this is the American solution to the present dilemma of the world strategic situation. This is why we must get rid of *I have a Drone Obama*, and return to Glass-Steagall now.

The reason this so-called Al Qaeda War cannot be won by either side is because each side believes it has a tactical mission to accomplish; advantages to gain by eliminating the other. That is what is wrong with understanding the world today. The secret behind this war is that while both enemies are manipulated by the British into exterminating each other, the agenda is to have a thermonuclear war

against Russian and China, a war of human extermination by reducing population from 7 billion to less than 1 billion. In other words, while the opponents each have their tactical objective in their sights, the British oligarchy has a world strategic interest to maintain their power intact. That's how the players are being given a script which has the appearance of justifying each player's limited purposes and apparent interests, while their self-imposed chains lead them to their tragic demise by letting the oligarchy run the show. That's the *Macbeth* scenario heading for thermonuclear World War III.

4. THE BRITISH STRATEGIC METHOD OF FANATIZATION AND VICTIMIZATION.

*“All you need to know is your weaknesses;
whatever is left over is your strength.”*

Dehors Debonneheure

Friedman identified precisely the cause of the Muslim hatred of America. It was not the hatred of America per se. It was the fact that America was supporting corrupt Islamic regimes. Since the British wanted the United States to enter into a war with the Muslim world, all they had to do was to light the fuse of the two powder kegs ready to explode in the Muslim world: fanatization and victimization. The fuse was the recognition that they could succeed against America because America had been proven incapable of winning any foreign war, as the war in Vietnam demonstrated as well as the Iranian hostage affair. As Friedman put it:

“This is the key strategic point. Al Qaeda was not motivated by hatred of the United States, American popular culture, or American democracy. The focus, instead, was on the Islamic world and its governments. Al Qaeda viewed the United States as the main Christian global power. As such, it had assumed a position of guarantor of existing regimes in the Islamic world. Put differently, Even if the United States wasn't directly responsible, it was viewed as the protector of the regimes by Islamic masses.” ([AMERICA'S SECRET WAR](#) p. 33)

Although the motives behind the creation of America as the enemy image of Islam were artificial, propaganda would do the rest to convince. The choice of terrorism as the form of irregular warfare was the key tactical measure to assure British success, because terrorism is unpredictable and causes uncontrollable fears in the minds of the enemy. “This was the strategic origin of September 11. Al Qaeda needed to strike a blow that would be devastating, leaving no doubt as to American vulnerability. It intended to breach the threshold between what was tolerable and intolerable for the United States. [...] September 11 was intended to be so brutal and humiliating that the United States would be forced, unequivocally, to launch a massive counterattack that would validate Al Qaeda's arguments to the Islamic masses.” ([AMERICA'S SECRET WAR](#), p. 35)

After 13 years into the Al Qaeda war, Al Qaeda has not succeeded in accomplishing what it intended to do, which was to create a massive rising in the Islamic world to recreate a worldwide Caliphate, and eliminate all “corrupt Islamic regimes.” The question is: why are they continuing to fight? Why then, as Friedman put it, is it that Al Qaeda's “fundamental failure is shaping the rest of the war”?

What is the unique form of Al Qaeda terrorism? The profile the British gave to Islamic terrorism was that it is the same as the terrorists of the 1960's. They were viewed as "psychological defectives" rather than as "astute operatives." That profile pleased the British, because the dumb American must continue to see Muslim radicals as "a dangerous but inconsequential nuisance." ([AMERICA'S SECRET WAR](#), p. 56) That cover was well groomed by the British as an invaluable "perception." This is how American security personnel at airports are trained to perceive Islamic terrorists. The idea was to have an image of them as being purely psychological deranged people, a sort of "moral monster" whose sole purpose was to get a kick at getting someone hurt. In this way, American strategists failed to understand the long term goal of the terrorist intent. The key is that Islamic terrorist had to have all of the appearance of not having any intention but to hurt Americans, simply because they are Americans. This is how the British exploited dumb American intelligence.

The key to the British success was that Americans must not go beyond what sounds reasonable. For example, intelligence must be "source oriented." In other words, intelligence must come directly from the people "on the ground." That's completely wrong, because intelligence must come from the mind, which is a completely different place and has a completely different texture. On the contrary, good intelligence comes from what sounds completely unreasonable. The key is to figure out who your real enemy is and how he thinks. As Lyn used to say, "Know your enemy." A good example of the stupidity of the typical CIA operative is his failure to see the collapse of the Soviet Union coming. As Friedman put it:

"The failure to anticipate first-order events is hardwired into the U.S intelligence system, owing to three factors. First, there is the organization of the U.S intelligence system. Second, there is the obsession with the collection of information rather than its analysis. Finally, there is a "committee system" that tries to achieve a compromise among stakeholders and, as a result, produces analyses that are marked not by bold insight, but by coalition building. It is a system designed to produce small facts rather than broad visions, and it can tell you a million things about Al Qaeda. But, it has a great deal of difficulty not only in building the big picture but filling in the blanks through logic, inference, and intuition." ([AMERICA'S SECRET WAR](#), p. 62)

The most important failure in CIA intelligence is located in their lack of understanding of the human mind. And therefore, their biggest mistake is to concentrate on "accurate evidence-based, comprehensive and timely foreign intelligence related to national security..." (63) In other words, "facts, facts, and facts." That's the reason why the CIA spends upwards of \$40 billion a year to gather these facts, and they fail to understand the big picture.

5. AN APPETITE FOR DECIPHERING WHAT DOESN'T MAKE ANY SENSE AT ALL

People generally think that the task of intelligence is to watch and wait on sources. That is wrong. Intelligence is forecasting the future and informing citizens about what they should know about their enemy and what they should do about it. In other words, the purpose of intelligence is to know your enemy and to pull his pants down wherever and whenever it is possible.

Take 9/11 as an example. Not a single intelligence service in the United States, except for EIR, saw 9/11 saw the attack coming. Why? Because, the answer was not to be found in the watch and wait game. And neither was the question: “How can you predict that nineteen Al Qaeda terrorists are going to hijack four planes without being noticed?” You cannot predict that. The only answer to “why” lies in the fact that the U.S. Government did know who the real enemy was, because the U.S. Government caused its own people to die in order to blame somebody else for the deed. From that standpoint, the only problem with the CIA is that it was in on this hidden agenda, and they made believe they didn’t know who the enemy was and what the war plan was.

Therefore, 9/11 should have become a heads up call, but it wasn’t. The key is to expect the unexpected from your enemy, and especially when your enemy is your own government. What act is your enemy willing to commit that doesn’t make sense at all? That’s what the US Government did. That’s the question that should be asked of an oligarchy at all times. As Friedman put it, an intelligence system should be created for the purpose of creating “smart analysts” who can make “the kind of unexpected, insightful connections that only human beings can make...” ([AMERICA’S SECRET WAR](#), p.72)

So, the question is: “What did the British know about Al Qaeda that they didn’t want American citizens to know?” They knew that the intelligence community in the United States could function only on consensus-based intelligence, that is, on the method known as “weight evidence” from sources. In other words, intelligence must be based on “being practical,” that is on the deductive method of what is to be expected and based on facts accepted by consensus. Any genial insight into a situation is forbidden and discarded. That’s the greatest blind spot of any intelligence organization, and most notably, the CIA. Therefore, 9/11 was the greatest blind spot for the CIA, because such an event could not have been forecasted based on consensus, but only by a leap of insight from a creative mind of someone who dares to think the impossible. In fact, the question should have been: “Is it possible that a Government might kill its own people?” And the answer of any intelligent person is a resounding: “Yes.”

British Intelligence knew the CIA was incapable of making such a leap, and therefore, they knew that the CIA could never find the purloined letter of Edgar Allen Poe, even if they were told it was hidden in plain sight. No one in the CIA ever thought, even for a fraction of a second, that Great Britain and Saudi Arabia could have been the ones that perpetrated the terrorist coup of 9/11 with the collaboration of the U.S. Government. And, you don’t need to have read the undisclosed 28 pages on 9/11 to know it. All you need to do is to make a few reasonable inferences based on the fact that it was too outrageous to appear credible, and you will be on the right track.

Ask yourself the following question: “How do you discover that it was the British who planned and executed 9/11 with the collaboration of Saudi Arabia and Al Qaeda?” All you have to do is to look at history and ask yourself who the historical enemy of the United States is. You will then have to remember that the British Empire and the American Republic are irreconcilable enemies. Irreconcilable is the key word, here. Unless you understand the fundamental historical difference of principle between the American Republic and the British Empire, you cannot answer that question. This is what strategic war planning is all about: Zeusian reduction of population or Promethean development of population. However, that is not enough. Unless you understand the difference between Zeus and Prometheus, you will not understand the life and death situation the British found themselves in after the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991. This historical question of principle emerged one more time. Who will be the sole

dominating force in the world after the cold war is over, Great Britain or the United States? This is how the danger of reconciliation between the United States and Russia became the greatest nightmare for the British oligarchy.

The reason why the Al Qaeda threat was not identified inside the United States before 9/11 is not because they were not “emitting intelligence” through their communications, but because the intelligence of their presence in the U.S. was blocked at the highest level of the FBI, and because the intelligence community was not trained in epistemological warfare. They did not understand how the mind works. They were looking at the wrong sources and they were not looking for the resonance of truth. The American intelligence community forgot to look into their own minds and into the minds of their true enemy. As Friedman put it: “The problem with sources is not that they aren’t useful but that they become a crutch on which intelligence organizations lean in order to evade responsibility.” ([AMERICA’S SECRET WAR](#), p. 77) And, the first responsibility of the CIA is to think.

The point of the matter, here, is that the truth is never based on facts but on the intention of a mind. Unless the orientation of the intelligence organizations is focused entirely on the intention behind the action, they will always be fooled, and most often than not, by British Intelligence operatives inside the United States. Why? Because the role of British Intelligence inside the United States is to misinform and disorient American intelligence. That’s the Mission of MI6. Therefore, you can’t win a war if you don’t know what it’s all about and who your real enemy is. So, the only way to know the truth in strategic thinking is to think the unthinkable. And, this is the reason why the CIA and the FBI were not able to understand what 9/11 was all about, because you need to be a genius to think the impossible. As Friedman put it:

“The geniuses want their own ideas put forward and regard everyone else as an obstacle to their greatness. At the CIA, the geniuses pose a huge problem. They see the world in idiosyncratic ways. They violate the carefully built process and consensus. They are irritating and slow down the process. Most of the time, they aren’t necessary. But in that rare instance – like September 11 – where the process cannot produce the right consensus, it takes a brilliant, intuitive leap to come up with the right answer. The U.S. intelligence community allows professionals and careerists to flourish. But it grinds idiosyncratic brilliance into dust.” ([AMERICA’S SECRET WAR](#), p. 77)

Friedman is right about the CIA lacking in genius, however, he is wrong in saying that it took a genius like Al Qaeda to launch 9/11. Friedman is wrong in saying: “However, it is an act of genius to surprise an adversary so completely that he has not even begun to think about how to deal with the threat. And, that is where Al Qaeda really hit the United States.” ([AMERICA’S SECRET WAR](#), p. 80) The reason Friedman is wrong is simply because 9/11 only required an enemy who knew that the targeted nation did not have the genius in its institutions to see something like this coming. That is all. In other words, such an act of terrorism against the United States could not have taken place under the intelligence of the Organization of Special Services (OSS) during the 1920’s. And I shall demonstrate why in my Section 7, in a moment.

6. WHAT IT MEANS FOR UKRAINE TO LIVE ON THE EDGE

“My father lived on the edge [Ukraine] until the Germans came in 1941 and swept everything before them, and then until the Soviets returned in 1944 and swept everything before them. He was one of tens of millions who lived or died on the edge, and perhaps nowhere was there as much suffering from living on the edge [as] in Ukraine. Ukraine was caught between Stalin and Hitler, between planned famines and outright slaughter, to be relieved only by the grinding misery of post-Stalin communism. No European country suffered as much in the 20th century as Ukraine. From 1914 until 1945, Ukraine was as close to hell as one can reach in this life.” (George Friedman, [Ukraine: On the Edge of Empires](#), Stratfor Geopolitical Weekly, Tuesday, December 17, 2013)

Friedman’s assessment of the current strategic situation in Ukraine is as follows:

“For Russia, Ukraine is a matter of fundamental national security. For a Western power, Ukraine is of value only if that power is planning to engage and defeat Russia, as the Germans tried to do in World War II. At the moment, given that no one in Europe or in the United States is thinking of engaging Russia militarily, Ukraine is not an essential asset. But from the Russian point of view it is fundamental, regardless of what anyone is thinking of at the moment. In 1932, Germany was a basket case; by 1941, it had conquered the European continent and was deep into Russia. One thing the Russians have learned in a long and painful history is to never plan based on what others are capable of doing or thinking at the moment. And given that, the future of Ukraine is never a casual matter for them.” (George Friedman, [Ukraine: On the Edge of Empires](#), Stratfor Geopolitical Weekly, Tuesday, December 17, 2013. Posted from the original *Geopolitical Journey, Part VI: Ukraine*)

Friedman is absolutely right; Ukraine is not an essential asset for the United States. So, why did the US Congress vote, on February 11, 2014, in favor of H. R. 447, by a margin of 383 to 2, in support of taking Ukraine away from the strategic interest of Russia? Because Ukraine is an essential asset for the British Empire, and what the U.S. is doing is for the benefit of the British intention of launching World War III. The error is for the idiots in the CIA to think that the Russians are going to back down. That regime change idea for Ukraine is a stupid idea and a deadly mistake, because the problem the European Union has is that if Ukraine accepts to enter into their game, they are finished. Why? Friedman answered:

“The troubles the European Union was facing did not strike pro-EU Ukrainians as changing the basic game. There was no question in their mind that they wanted Ukraine in the European Union, nor was there any question in their mind that the barriers to entry were in the failure of the Ukrainians to measure up. The idea that EU expansion had suffered a fatal blow due to the Irish or Greek crises was genuinely inconceivable to them. The European Union was not going to undergo any structural changes. Nothing that was happening in the European Union

impacted its attractiveness or its openness. It was all about Ukraine measuring up.” (George Friedman, [*Ukraine: On the Edge of Empires*](#))

And, there is the rub. The European Union is bankrupt and finished. That’s the long and the short of it. And, this is what is generating the desperation of the U.S. Congress vote in favor of H. R. 447. It is a last ditch effort to make believe that the EU is still alive and that the British free-trade system can be salvaged in order to save other countries. Poor fools. Friedman saw clearly what the Ukrainian paradox was: The population is divided between personal financial sovereignty and National sovereignty: two opposite and contradictory tracks at the same time. Splitting your mind in two like this is not a smart move. So, the real choice is: Either you join the EU and NATO and you die, or you join the Russian Federation and you have a future. There is no doubt as to which option Ukraine might have to take if she wishes to survive. Which way it will go no one knows.

However, the imminent danger, here, is the current scenario of a regime change in Ukraine. The U.S. must now heed the call of the Russian memorandum titled “*Save Ukraine*” which appeared in the Russian Edition of the weekly *Zavtra* on February 12, 2014. See the LaRouchePAC report: [*EXCLUSIVE: Citing Cuban Missile Crisis, Leading Russian Grouping Sees Plans for War Over Ukraine*](#), February 12, 2014.

7. THE AMERICAN WAR PLAN RED AGAINST GREAT BRITAIN

“It’s not the economy: It’s your mind, stupid!”

Dehors Debonneheure

This leads us to having to think the impossible, which is for America to make plans for going to war with one of the most peaceful nations of the world today, Canada. This plan is so unthinkable that most intelligence, psychology, and military professionals consider it “outlandish,” “laughable,” and even a “collective neurosis.” Not a single intelligence report considered the necessary state of perplexity that such a plan requires for the mind to understand what the reason behind it might have been. Everybody took this *War Plan Red* at the face value effect that it produces on the public opinion-dominated minds of today, and consequently, all intelligence reports made the same mistake of refusing to investigate the historical specificity of the conflict and the reason behind it.

War Plan Red was a war plan that the United States Army and Navy devised during the 1920’s and 1930’s as a potential war plan between the United States and Great Britain, which included the invasion of Canada, dubbed “Plan Crimson.” EIR strategist Carl Osgood gave an excellent summary of the significance of the plan in his report on [*When the American Military Understood the British Empire*](#), EIR, March 20, 2009. In view of the current drive by Great Britain to involve the United States in a thermonuclear war against Russia and China, I recommend that people read Osgood’s article and review this plan with the appropriate sense of foreboding about what is about to happen to this planet if we don’t get Obama out of office.

The contention between the United States and the British Empire is based on two fundamentally different conceptions of economics: credit-based industrial development versus financial speculative free-trade. This difference was expressed clearly by Navy Lt. Cdr. Holloway H. Frost during a series of lectures on the subject of American Strategy in the Atlantic presented at the General Staff College on September 9, 1919, when he stated about the social and industrial conditions of unrest in the British Dominions:

"But while these conditions apparently render a war with Great Britain an impossibility, they may even be the direct cause of such a war. A revolution is today a possibility in any country; and once this is accomplished, it is impossible to predict what course the revolutionists may take; possibly they may, like the Russians, engage in war against their former allies. But even assuming the impossibility of the success of a revolution in Great Britain, may not the desperate conditions, which exist, drive her into a war, if it becomes demonstrated that they can be improved in no other way?" (Dean Andromidas, [*When America Fought the British Empire and Its Treacherous Sykes-Picot Treaty*](#), EIR, January 27, 2009)

What made Frost raise this question of "an impossibility" of war with Great Britain is the fact that the cause of such a war is grounded in *economics of self-interest*. It is as if Frost were merely admitting that unless man changes, he is bound to wage war against his neighbor, merely because of his belief in animalistic self interest instincts; that is, solely for defending a purely animalistic as opposed to human sense of self-protection against a potentially predatory neighbor. Then, he gives the reason why Americans might have to engage in such a war on purely economic grounds; that is, because the British have not yet understood that you cannot base economics purely on trade and on exclusive control of trade routes, because free-trade, as a monetarist conception of economics, is bound to go into negative balance, sooner or later and self-cannibalize itself. So, Frost goes on to say:

"It is evident that no nation, which bases its prosperity on trade, can exist with an adverse trade balance of four billions, annually; a figure which the British estimate will increase in the near future, rather than decrease. The United States is the direct cause of this adverse trade balance. If it develops that we can successfully compete with England on the seas, this adverse balance will be maintained. A nation doomed to commercial defeat will usually demand a military decision before this commercial defeat is complete. Therefore, there is always the possibility that the British, however friendly they may wish to be, may be forced into a war to maintain their commercial supremacy of the seas, which is essential to the existence of the British Empire." (Dean Andromidas, [*When America Fought the British Empire and Its Treacherous Sykes-Picot Treaty*](#), EIR, January 27, 2009)

Effectively, any nation that bases its economic life on such imbalance of trade is bound to collapse or go to war. It is as if war had been built into the British free-trade system from the very beginning, and as long as this insane practice is accepted by Britain's trade partners, there will be war with or against Britain. Carl Osgood also showed how Frost proposed that the American Army and Navy jointly prepare a scenario of a possible war against Great Britain and its Dominions. "In the opening phase, he (Frost) supposed that Britain would launch a land campaign from Canada, and attack the U. S. Atlantic seaboard, the Panama Canal Zone, and U.S. possessions in the Caribbean. The U.S. plan of attack should be to take control of the entrance of the St. Lawrence Seaway, capture British possessions in

the Western Atlantic and the Caribbean, and with that accomplished, attack British commerce throughout the world, and invade and capture Canada.” (Carl Osgood, [*When the American Military Understood the British Empire*](#), EIR, March 20, 2009)

This historical evidence alone should be enough to demonstrate that it is the insanity of the British free-trade system which is the motive for war preparation, not the Hamiltonian-American credit-system of economics. This is what makes the American and the British systems incompatible, and which makes the conflict between the two inevitable. However, this does not mean that you have to go to war. Peace is superior to war; thus, another path must be found to resolve the problem. But, unless you enter into the appropriate state of perplexity on this very question, you will never know what this necessary unthinkable situation represents for your mind. This is the axiomatic crux of the matter, and this is the reason why one must think the unthinkable if there is to be peace in the world today.

In conclusion, here are four crucial dates that you should never forget. On July 25, 1914, French Socialist leader, Jean Jaurès, delivered a speech in Vaise, next to Lyon, in which he forecasted: “Now maybe we are on the eve of the day when Austria will attack the Serbs, and when Germany and Austria attack Serbia and Russia, it means that Europe will be on fire”. Three days later, on July 28, 1914, Austria declared war against Serbia. Three days later, Jaurès was assassinated on July 31, 1914. Four days later, on August 4, 1914, Germany declared war against France. When you are tempted to think that you cannot know the future, I recommend that you remember Jaurès and those four dates.

FIN