

Modern Warfare

by cleaves *Tuesday, Mar 8 2005, 3:49am*

international / peace/war / feature

(Mythologies of Supremacy)

A popular myth of today is that America is the “undisputed” leading military power of the world. However, does this claim stand up to the scrutiny of even the simplest analysis? All things are relative in a military context so the obvious question is against whom is this ‘power’ dominant? The combined nuclear assets of the Sino-Russian alliance alone is enough to dispatch the entire American continent, if the sheer force of numbers (manpower) is included, the ‘winner’ would be the Chinese and Russians. In the context of all-out war the one absolute fact (that the US attempts to ignore) is mutual assured destruction. The Zionist lunatics (Perle, Wolfowitz, Rumsfeld) who persuaded Bush to abandon nuclear disarmament treaties, thereby giving other nations similar license, have put us all in jeopardy.

Where do present realities place America in a world where the proliferation of nuclear weapons has now reached alarming proportions? Your answer is as valid as any strategist’s or analyst’s for the simple reason that the situation is extremely unstable and unpredictable – nuclear assets are now in the hands of relatively poor nations that are as fanatical in their zeal as Bush or Bin Laden. In today’s world, the claim that any single nation possesses military supremacy is a dangerous nonsense.

A feature of modern warfare is the unbalanced nature of military conflict. The smaller mobile force that chooses the type, time and place for an attack and then disappears into the background steals the advantage from the larger (lumbering) opponent who must deploy huge resources and energy to be ever alert for this type of action. The larger opponent is forced to adopt a defensive posture – and as every military cadet knows, it is the side that dictates the terms of battle that eventually prevails.

Another point (among many) is the shift away from national conflict to that of an opposition that is not readily identifiable in the traditional sense. Today, it is small bands of men against nations, which effectively prohibits the use of technologies designed for national conflicts. These ‘small bands’ are not to be underestimated. In view of the large amounts of plutonium that have ‘gone missing’ it is safe to assume that fanatics are in possession of some of this material and have no need for processing uranium – the black market having catered for all their needs. These Stateless ‘bands’ would then possess the paralysing advantage of being able to strike with nuclear weapons without offering a retaliatory target. The consequences of such an attack would be destabilising on a global scale.

The ‘Gung-Ho’ mentality of Bush and his advisers has placed America in a precarious position, only fools and feeble mentalities believe myth and propaganda. When insane zealots (and others) would attempt to deceive with lies and myths of supremacy, think carefully, the consequences may be dire.

War has never served the interests of the people – it is the warmongers who are and have always been the enemy.

Cleaves Alternative News. <http://cleaves.lingama.net/news/story-66.html>