

The NATO summit: Missiles for Europe?

by Rachel Douglas

The foreign ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries, meeting in Brussels as we go to press, are set to reach a compromise decision on the controversial plan for NATO to produce and station nearly 600 American Pershing II and cruise missiles in Western Europe. It is expected that the session will approve the plan, but also issue a call for negotiations with the Warsaw Pact nations on this class of weapons.

The Warsaw Pact foreign ministers, after their own meeting in East Berlin Dec. 6, cautiously intimated that they have not closed off the channels for such talks, although their communiqué repeated Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko's recent warnings that a favorable NATO decision for this type of modernization would "destroy the basis for negotiations" on medium-range missiles. The ministers qualified their warning by adding that this would not occur until the plan was fully implemented and the missiles ready for deployment—which is due to be in 1983. This wording was read in Bonn and elsewhere as an easing of the Soviet line, indicating that talks could take place during that four-year interim.

The stage is thus set for talks on the limitation of medium-range nuclear weapons—known as "gray area" arms because they have escaped coverage both in the Soviet-American Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) and the European-theater conventional disarmament forum in Vienna, which will begin soon after the NATO conference now in session. What is not deter-

mined, is what international context will shape these new talks.

There are two fundamentally opposed approaches to disarmament current within NATO. One belongs to Great Britain and the New York Council on Foreign Relations and has been adopted by the Carter administration. It casts disarmament as a means toward dismantling the scientific and industrial capabilities of developed countries and applying genocidal "appropriate technologies" in the developing sector.

The London-centered strategists, who advocate disarmament for these purposes, simultaneously promote arms build-up, for the sake of gaining clout to secure Soviet acquiescence to their policies. The result of their strategic commitment, if it prevails, is certain war.

The second conception of disarmament in Europe is that of French President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing and Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of West Germany. For these leaders, the founders of the European Monetary System, military detente with the Soviet Union is indispensable for a safe climate in which to pursue a trade-based economic recovery. By the same token, they insist that only economic development and East-West cooperation for a high-technology industrial growth policy, including Third World development, can provide a firm basis for peace and for arms negotiations. Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev and his factional allies share this outlook, but it is opposed by a pro-London Soviet faction presently on the upswing in the U.S.S.R.

The line-up on missile plan

Going into the ministers' session, there was a three-way split within NATO on how to move with respect to the medium-range missile development plan.

Washington and London. The Carter administration and the Thatcher government in Britain are energetically seeking approval of the Pershing and cruise deployment. The Cossiga government in Italy will vote with them.

In the perspective of Washington and London, the NATO arms decision is subsumed in a broader campaign to destroy the European Monetary System. A chief weapon in that campaign today is the crisis in Iran, through invoking the threat of oil cutoff and the currency disruptions that occur with the freezing of Iranian assets held in Europe. It was therefore an accurate reflection of the tension between the U.S. and the allies that Secretary of Defense Harold Brown, speaking at the NATO defense ministers' pre-meeting in Brussels Dec. 11, reportedly opened his speech not with the medium-range missiles agenda item, but with Iran. Speaking "bluntly," according to the *Washington Post*, Brown demanded "concrete economic and diplomatic steps" by Western Europe at Washington's bidding.

The *New York Times'* senior Europeanist, Flora Lewis, declared that the missiles issue "was overshadowed at least for a day by the crisis in Iran."

Even viewed, for a moment, apart from the strategic context typified by the Iran crisis leverage against Europe, the missile deployment that NATO is to decide on is militarily momentous for Europe.

London and Washington field two arguments in its favor.

One is a matter of numbers: counting up whether the Warsaw Pact has more forces trained on Europe than NATO does, and determining what to do if that is the case. The Pentagon holds that the Soviet SS-20 rocket, a medium-range missile with multiple independent reentry vehicles (MIRVs), with which the U.S.S.R. has steadily been replacing its older SS-4 and SS-5 rockets, gives the Warsaw Pact a qualitative and quantitative advantage that must be matched.

The "numbers" argument is disputed, not only by the Soviets, but by numerous military analysts in the West.

West German Defense Minister Hans Apel told the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* Dec. 11 that he thought the "big threat" from the Soviet SS-20's was exaggerated. In a more detailed analysis, retired Lieutenant-General Baudissin of the Hamburg Institute for Peace Research authorized an aide to write in the *Frankfurter Rundschau* that the new NATO weapons would be "militarily useless."

The second, more fundamental Anglo-American ar-

gument is what Henry Kissinger calls "decoupling." The continental members of Europe should no longer be protected by the American nuclear umbrella, according to this idea, but by the continental force of Pershing II's and cruise missiles plus other existing armaments in Europe. Kissinger links "decoupling" to the strategy of "limited nuclear war," proposing that if the United States is decoupled from the defense of Europe—and does not fire its intercontinental ballistic missiles against the Soviet Union during a putative Soviet land attack on Western Europe—then war will be limited to Europe and the U.S. will be spared.

The Netherlands and Scandinavia. Great Britain, while officially sharing the American "hawk" position, has released several trained doves in the smaller NATO countries. Going into the foreign ministers sessions Dec. 12, the Netherlands, Norway, and Denmark were expected to oppose the plan outright, while Belgium would argue for a six-month postponement of the decision.

British-linked left and liberal parties in these countries are responsible for their stance. In Holland, for instance, the van Agt government depends for a parliamentary majority on the Dutch Social Democrats, who vehemently oppose the Pershing deployment.

The British are walking both sides of the fence because a Europe split over NATO strategy would make it more difficult for Schmidt and Giscard to unite behind the EMS. London strategists also anticipate that Schmidt, emerging as the architect of a compromise reconciliation of the hawks and doves, will be left to preside over an outcome that may compromise *him* politically if the NATO sweetener—an offer to the Soviets to talk on medium-range weapons—is rejected by Moscow.

Germany. Despite efforts by the *New York Times* to portray the missile plan as Helmut Schmidt's brainchild, the truth is that the West German leadership has been wary of the proposed missile deployment from the moment it was floated as an idea many months ago. The placement of nuclear weapons on West German soil, with the trigger control in the hands of the Americans, is a touchy question for the German population that would be underneath where the Soviet bombs fell in retaliation.

From the beginning, therefore, Schmidt has insisted that West Germany would not consent to be the only European NATO country besides Britain to host the American rockets. This is one factor that gives weight to the Dutch say in Brussels.

Kissinger's "decoupling" scenario is not attractive to the West Germans either, because Bonn knows that "limited nuclear war" is a pipedream. The Russians have said in terms that leave no room for doubt, that a strike

launched by U.S. weapons from Western European soil is a strategic strike subject to retaliation by the full Soviet strategic arsenal against Western Europe and North America.

Schmidt and his defense minister Hans Apel have put together a platform for the NATO session. The *London Times*, which monitors the Germans' moves closely, forecast that their proposals to accompany the missile decision would be five:

1. Unilateral withdrawal of 1,000 obsolete American nuclear warheads from Western Europe;
2. A proposal by West Germany at the deadlocked Vienna Mutual Balanced Force Reduction talks (covering central Europe) for the simultaneous withdrawal of 13,000 American and 30,000 Soviet troops from the area;
3. Concrete proposals to start talks on reducing theater nuclear weapons in Europe, in the context of SALT III;
4. Strong West German support for "hitherto ne-

glected French proposals" for a general disarmament conference covering all forces in Europe west of the Ural mountains;

5. A demand for ratification of SALT II by the U.S. Senate.

The reference to the French proposals is crucial to understanding Schmidt's approach. Although France is not a member of the NATO military organization, Paris is working with Bonn to shift European disarmament talks onto a pro-EMS track, including the convening of a pan-European disarmament conference. The French conference idea was backed by Soviet President Brezhnev in an Oct. 6 speech. On Dec. 8, Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Bohuslav Chnoupek said that preparations for such a conference should begin immediately.

West Germany's Foreign Minister Hans Dietrich Genscher will soon travel to Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary to discuss a "broad-based disarmament initiative." These proposals are also certain to figure in

The fallacies of British and American strategy

The Soviets and the French have both exposed the strategic incompetence of the American and British thinking that went into the ideas of "decoupling" and "limited nuclear war." Since Atlantic strategists as prominent as Henry Kissinger have used these concepts to motivate a favorable decision on upgrading NATO's medium range missiles in Western Europe, and because the West Germans lend an ear to French and Russian arguments against them, *EIR* excerpts here the views of *Le Figaro's* Paul-Marie de la Gorce and *Pravda's* Vladimir Bolshakov on these questions.

In his Dec. 10 article, "The Euromissiles—A Stake in the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Rivalry," de la Gorce disposed of the idea that these weapons would be used in retaliation to a Soviet land advance. Rather, they would have to be used first.

"The real strategic import of the installation of a new American arsenal in Europe must be understood. The experts will certainly discuss this for a long time, but a first appreciation may be offered now.

"If the Soviets take the initiative of a general offensive against the European NATO countries, the Pershing IIs would immediately lose a large part of

their effectiveness, because the designated targets would have been emptied by the offensive itself (barracks, troop concentrations, bases, depots, headquarters, etc.): only damage that could be caused to fixed infrastructure would then be important. The cruise missiles ... would only have a limited effectiveness against forces that were rapidly advancing, unless they were equipped with extremely powerful nuclear charges that would cause enormous damages.

"If the initiative was the West's, however, the effectiveness of the Pershing II and cruise missiles would be considerable, compared with the use of the SS-20 by the Soviets. ... In sum, the Eurostrategic weapons, whether deployed in the East or the West, would place a high premium on surprise for the one who took the initiative."

Writing *Pravda's* authoritative "International Survey" column Dec. 9, Vladimir Bolshakov said:

"During the Vietnam war, American futurologist Herman Kahn developed a series of escalation scenarios for the stepwise progress of armed conflict to the brink of thermonuclear war. At the highest rung of the ladder were the United States' intercontinental missiles.

"NATO headquarters recently recollected these scenarios all of a sudden, in the following connection. NATO military doctrine provides that 'NATO must be able to expand a war as far as its enemy can.' But the enemy, i.e., the Soviet Union, has ICBMs while NATO

Schmidt's talks with Brezhnev in Moscow next March and with East German leader Erich Honecker, whom he will meet in the spring.

A Soviet time bomb

But time is running out. The pro-London, "Jacobin" faction in the Soviet Union, which operates under control of British agents Kim Philby and Donald Maclean who are lodged in the Soviet establishment, is using Schmidt's compromise formula for the NATO meeting to argue that the Bonn-Paris war avoidance strategy is a fraud. They say that the Western Europeans will knuckle under to "U.S. imperialism" when push comes to shove, and therefore that the best tack for Moscow is weakening the West through "Jacobin" destabilizations on every possible front. This is the Soviet faction which is presently backing Ayatollah Khomeini in Iran on the grounds that the Ayatollah, however "reactionary," is anti-American.

If this line were to win out in Moscow, there would be virtually nothing to prevent world war.

(from which in such propagandistic explanations the U.S. is 'excluded') allegedly does not. So what if the Soviet Union decides to strike NATO with all its forces? What then?

"The NATO strategists prefer to remain silent about the fact that the Soviet Union, as even the Western press admits, 'has no rational alternative to such a strike.' But they assure the Europeans that the Pershing IIs and cruise missiles are needed in order to be able to launch a 'retaliatory strike' against the U.S.S.R.

"Tipsying up the steps of the ladder, the NATO strategists use the arguments of former Secretary of State H. Kissinger, who announced in Brussels last September that the Western Europeans should not count on the American 'nuclear umbrella' anymore, since the United States would use its ICBMs only for the defense of its own territory. This statement inspired the hawks on both sides of the Atlantic. The Americans are told that they should cough up to help Western Europe arm so heavily that the U.S. doesn't have to intervene in any conflict of NATO with the Warsaw Pact and thus risk its own cities.

"But these rockets add nothing to the security of either the U.S. or Western Europe. Kissinger's arguments... are untenable. This is why... the Washington Post (writes) that... 'The decision to use these weapons would be taken by the President of the U.S., as before, and American cities would risk a Soviet retaliatory strike just as much as before...'"

IRELAND

Prime Minister Jack Lynch forced into resignation

The sudden resignation of Irish prime Minister Jack Lynch marks the second initiating government of the European Monetary System to fall since the system's creation in the summer of 1978. As Ireland's head of state for nine years, Lynch had campaigned vigorously for a domestic policy based on industrialization and technological growth, allying himself in the recent period with the efforts of France's Giscard and West Germany's Schmidt to establish a European Monetary System. Under Lynch's leadership, the Republic of Ireland achieved the fastest growth rate in Europe.

The new Prime Minister of Ireland, Charles Haughey—who was elected head of the ruling Fianna Fail party in a special caucus meeting Dec. 7—is not likely to make either economic development or relations with Europe his top agenda item. Ireland will more than likely be plunged into a bloody repeat of the 1921-22 civil war which tore the country apart and enabled the British to establish a base for their intelligence operations in Northern Ireland.

In 1970 Haughey, who was then Finance Minister, stood trial on a charge of conspiring to import guns into Ireland allegedly for use by Irish Republican Army (IRA) terrorists. Haughey was acquitted. His sympathy for the aims of the IRA, however, is well known. In his first press conference, the Prime Minister-designate, a self-made millionaire whose hobby is breeding horses, announced that he intends to seek early withdrawal of British forces from Northern Ireland—a policy which can only have the most dangerous and violent consequences if not accompanied by a firm political and economic foundation for restoring social peace.

British plotted against Lynch

Although Haughey and company have played a key role in discrediting Lynch's policies, the ouster of Lynch had been planned by the British since at least December of 1978 when Lynch joined forces with Schmidt and Giscard, breaking Ireland's historic link with the pound sterling and hooking the Irish "punt" into the EMS currency snake.

The plan became fully operational last August when Lord Louis Mountbatten—a relative of the British Royal