

## The Malvinas crisis and NATO's 'Tonkin Gulf'

by Cynthia Rush and Lydia Cherry

The Defense Ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) resolved at their meeting in Brussels on May 7 that member nations "may be required to facilitate" military operations "outside of the NATO area" which "threaten the vital interests of members of the Alliance." Confirming *EIR's* warnings that NATO is being restructured as a gendarme for conventional wars against the underdeveloped sector, this "out-of-area" policy—described by *EIR* founder Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. as a "Tonkin Gulf resolution," the 1964 Senate decision to let the executive branch throw the United States into the Vietnam War—was a strategic victory for Great Britain in its effort to capture the U.S. "brawn" on behalf of its geopolitical goals. Commented one British military source smugly: "NATO has just adopted the British Empire doctrine."

Article 8 of the NATO ministers' communiqué (see page 36) also contained a reference to the possibility of NATO support for U.S. military bases in Southwest Asia, i.e. Pakistan and possibly Iran. That would be a giant stride toward ringing the Soviet Union's borders with NATO installations and U.S. Rapid Deployment Force capabilities, something the U.S.S.R. has affirmed it will not tolerate. *Faced with that policy, Moscow could conclude that it has little choice but to go to war.*

In the Malvinas conflict, U.S. support for Great Britain has already widened the conflict. Despite the loss of the H.M.S. *Sheffield* and other grave setbacks, London extended its blockade May 7 to everything more than 12 nautical miles off Argentina's coast. In order to enforce that, U.S. refueling capabilities and other heavy

support would be required, support which as of May 8 was rumored to be forthcoming.

### Military and political options

That Argentina would sink H.M.S. *Sheffield*—the 3,500-ton British destroyer equipped with sophisticated electronic equipment which allowed it to detect and destroy guided missiles—was clearly not on Britain's agenda. The sinking of the *Sheffield* is said to have left the British blinded electronically, eliminating the option of a British landing on the Malvinas in the face of Argentina's superior airpower. In some sources' estimation, the British will probably opt for a "crazed strike at the Argentine mainland," possibly using American B-52 bombers based at Ascension Island.

On May 6, half the Conservatives in the House of Commons had supported a resolution offered by Winston Churchill III demanding that Britain bomb the mainland. It was defeated; but the next day Defense Secretary Francis Pym stated that his ministry indeed had contingency plans for carrying out such an attack.

World capitals were buzzing May 7 with reports that the British aircraft carrier *Hermes* was crippled. Many in London acknowledge that the British military is in real trouble. "If a carrier is sunk, we've lost the war," Simon May, an adviser to former Tory Prime Minister Ted Heath, said May 7.

Latin American heads of state met the weekend of May 8 in Costa Rica in the first of a series of discussions

on the restructuring of the inter-American system. It is expected that the heads of state will formally demand that President Reagan pull the United States back from its unequivocal support of the Royal Family.

Indicative of the atmosphere in most of Latin America, in Venezuela banner headlines announced the Venezuelan Foreign Minister's call for a revision in the security agreements for the continent. "Venezuela Accuses the U.S. of Violating the Rio Treaty," one headline read. Leading Venezuelan politicians were questioned by the press on whether any common ground for mutual security arrangements between a "developed" country and "poorer countries" can now exist. The Venezuelan press line is that the entirety of postwar agreements in the hemisphere is dead.

In spite of the incessant pro-British propaganda which the U.S. population has been subjected to, world opinion is not as solidly on the British side as were the NATO Defense Ministers in Brussels. As Argentine President Galtieri said in a speech to his nation May 2: "The great majority of the peoples of America have given us a frank and clear response, a response of fraternity and solidarity. This is the attitude of those who always believed . . . that this continent had its project and its destiny, and that its colonial past was dead.

"The responsibility for having endangered international peace," he continued, "falls on the British government and those who support it . . . the responsibility for having broken the peace of the Americas . . . falls on the shoulders of those who attack us."

The Argentine President blasted the United States "not only for denying the principles to which it has formally adhered for more than 33 years, but for supporting by its acts the colonial pretensions in America of a European power, and imposing illegal and unjust economic and material sanctions."

### **'Who makes U.S. policy?'**

In a release that blanketed Capitol Hill May 8, the Advisory Committee Chairman of the National Democratic Policy Committee, Lyndon LaRouche also went after U.S. "capitulation," noting that a large group of Senators had been prepared to enact a resolution reaffirming the Monroe Doctrine, the public law of the United States, but were panicked into passing a resolution which violates this law. (See Editorial, page 64.)

"Who makes the policy of the United States under such conditions?" LaRouche asks. "Is it Sen. Malcolm Wallop, a loyal member of the family of the British Earl of Portsmouth? Is it the British aristocratic family, the Moores? Is it the long-standing agent of British financial interests, the house of Morgan? Is it the faction attached to the husband of Pamela Churchill Harriman? Is it a pack of Rhodes scholars, beneficiaries of a

Rhodes trust established for the explicit purpose of subverting the United States?"

LaRouche, whose NDPC has been attempting to educate public officials on American history, emphasizes that the British assault on the Malvinas was predominantly a war *against the United States*, and to the British oligarchical grouping the sinking of its entire fleet would be a relatively small price to pay for taking over the United States and NATO.

Speaking to representatives from 13 embassies who attended a Bonn *EIR* conference May 6, LaRouche recommended that "Britain be put under Irish receivership for the next 60 years."

### **Upping the ante**

LaRouche noted that Britain's sinking the Argentine cruiser *General Belgrano* on May 2 was also a way to gain free access to Chilean waters and make use of that country's southernmost base at Punto Arenas. Since Chile and Argentina dispute ownership of the Beagle Islands at the tip of South America, Britain would attempt to bring Chile into the war on its side so as to tie up Argentina in a two-front war.

Such a strategy, LaRouche warned, would swiftly lead to Peru and Bolivia entering the war on the side of Argentina, and end up in a replay of the 1879 War of the Pacific, also orchestrated by Great Britain. London would also try to set off other simmering border disputes such as those between Colombia and Venezuela, or Venezuela and Guyana.

Should wars of this nature take place, they would carry out the Global 2000 depopulation plan promulgated by the Carter administration under the influence of British Malthusians. The continent would be wracked by a series of "conventional" wars which would wipe out entire sections of already underpopulated Latin America.

All of these contingencies lower the threshold for eventual thermonuclear confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union, Argentina's most important trading partner, has stated that it considers the United States to be acting as an agent of British foreign policy, and that further military adventures in Latin America will not be tolerated. The U.S. alliance with Great Britain gave that country a "green light" to carry out its military aggression against Argentina, a Tass release charged on May 3. Tass previously warned that any attempt to interfere with Argentine grain shipments in the Atlantic would be viewed as a "hostile" act.

Currently the United States is providing Britain with intelligence received from mobile satellite communications devices, as well as fuel and refueling rights on Ascension Island. According to unnamed Pentagon officials cited in the May 5 *Boston Globe*, the U.S.

surveillance capability has enabled the United States to receive copies of all orders transmitted to the Argentine high command and hand them over to the British.

This "modest" aid for Great Britain's colonialist warfare is already costing the United States \$1 million a day. By itself, Great Britain, which has been bankrupted by its anti-industrial economic policies, cannot finance a war in South America.

## From the NATO communiqué

*What follows is Paragraph 8 of the May 7 communiqué of the Defense Ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.*

The ministers stressed their common interest in the security, stability and sovereign independence of the countries outside of the NATO area, and at the same time stressed . . . military operations in areas outside of NATO as having the potential to threaten the vital interests of members of the alliance. Members of the alliance are able to contribute either directly or indirectly to the effect of deterring aggression and to respond to requests by nations outside the NATO area to help in resisting threats to their security or independence.

In this respect, they reaffirm that consultations on any out-of-area deployments . . . such as emerging from the U.S. concept of Rapid Deployment Forces are intended to identify common objectives taking full account of the political situation in the areas concerned, and of the effect on alliance security and defense capability as well as the national interests of countries. . . .

The ministers recognize that the policies which nations adopt in this field are a matter of national decision. The ministers confirmed that the effect of such a deployment on alliance security and defense capabilities should be examined collectively in the appropriate NATO bodies.

In this respect, NATO ministers stressed that contingency activities must take account of requirements which may arise from such consultations. They also agreed that in the light of NATO consultations, members of the alliance may be required to facilitate out-of-area deployments in support of the vital interests of all. The military committee is studying the implications for the alliance of the United States' strategic conception for Southwest Asia. Report will be made to Defense Ministers at the December NATO meeting.



## Churchill: 'No danger in attacking mainland'

*Winston Churchill III, a Conservative Member of Parliament and a leader of the Tory ultra-right, offered a resolution in the House of Commons on May 6, supported by half the Conservative M.P.s, to bomb the Argentine mainland. Below are excerpts from a May 6 EIR interview with Mr. Churchill.*

**EIR:** From your standpoint, where will the next steps lead in this conflict in the Argentine theatre?

**Churchill:** We are still anxious for a negotiated settlement. We'd be happy to accept a ceasefire once there was evidence that the Argentines were willing to comply with U.N. Resolution 502 and remove their invading forces from the Falklands. We must liberate our countrymen and kick the invaders out of the Falklands, if negotiations fail.

**EIR:** How does the sinking of the *Sheffield* affect your country's approach to the conflict?

**Churchill:** The sinking of the *Sheffield* and the *Belgrano* compresses the time-scale in this situation, whether it be for negotiations or for military action.

**EIR:** Are you thinking that your country must now attack the Argentine mainland directly?

**Churchill:** There is a strong case for the United States taking positive action to redress the air imbalance. We could do this in two ways. One would be to strike the bases where the aircraft is based that is responsible for damaging the *Sheffield*. Or, we could double our Harrier deployment on the scene.

**EIR:** We have heard that your country is appealing for the United States to supply B-52s for use in the conflict, whether flown by British pilots or by Americans.

**Churchill:** The B-52s are not nearly as capable as our Vulcan bombers. We don't need B-52s! What you are

saying is absurd! Can you imagine American crews bombing a Latin American country? Anyway, I prefer our pilots any time. Regularly, when there are organized competitions between our RAF and the American pilots, we win the competition. So why should we want American pilots, when our people are superior?

**EIR:** But hitting the air bases in Argentina would minimally meet the Argentinians' heavy air defense.

**Churchill:** What the Argentines can put up is peanuts compared to what the Vulcan has been equipped to do vis-à-vis penetrating the much denser Soviet air defenses. I know for an absolute fact that there is no military problem if the government seeks to hit the bases on the mainland. The Soviets have 12,000 air-to-air missiles for their defense, and the Vulcan is prepared to penetrate these, so, relatively speaking, as I said, what the Argentinians have is peanuts.

**EIR:** Some of our sources tell us that any attempt to hit the Argentine mainland would be the first shot in World War III.

**Churchill:** You have access to extremely silly sources! Why would the Soviets come in? They have no defense treaty with Argentina. We are fully entitled to take such defensive measures as are appropriate under the United Nations charter.

**EIR:** What is your evaluation of how the United States is acting, from the standpoint of what you expect in the future from the United States?

**Churchill:** The United States has acted according to all Britain's expectations. Mr. Haig did exactly what was necessary in seeking to have a mediated settlement. I just regret that he couldn't bring those fascist thugs to heel in time to prevent further conflict.

## Latin Americans protest Washington's policy

*Since Alexander Haig and Anglophiles in the U.S. Senate manipulated the United States onto the side of Britain in the Anglo-Argentine conflict, Latin American leaders have condemned the U.S. action as the rupture of inter-American relations and voiced their solidarity with Argentina. Here is a sampling of recent statements by Latin American leaders.*

### Venezuela

• Foreign Relations Minister José Zambrano Velasco accused the United States of being "an accomplice of colonial violence" in the Americas and warned that

the United States siding with Britain "will affect the future of inter-American relations [because] it contravenes the letter and the spirit of the TIAR [1947 Rio Treaty] resolution."

• President of Congress Godofredo González blamed "Washington for the explosion of armed conflict in the South Atlantic. The battles were precipitated by the United States . . . The world asks itself what effectiveness could TIAR have if the United States has repeatedly violated its precepts."

• Venezuela's chiefs of the navy and army issued a joint declaration stating: "We only await a presidential order to put our professional capabilities at the disposition of our brother republic of Argentina."

• Venezuela's OAS Ambassador, Hilarion Cardozo: "The United States has destroyed its foreign policy in Latin America, which it has built up over many years, by helping England in this crisis. . . . It is a little premature to talk of reorganizing the OAS, but my government is thinking of a purely Latin American organization for the future."

### Peru

• Peruvian Minister of War Luis Cisneros pledged that "The Peruvian army is ready to intervene in support of Argentina, if circumstances require it. . . . The position taken by the United States is a very serious problem because it does away with the doctrine promulgated by President Monroe's America for the Americans."

• Foreign Minister Javier Arias Stella: "A country like the United States, which has been propounding the thesis of the Americas for the Americans, now appears to be propounding the thesis of the Americas for Great Britain. Mr. Haig's statement was anti-historical. . . ."

### Costa Rica

• President Rodrigo Carazo charged that the behavior of the United States, "constitutes a rupture of continental solidarity . . . a severe blow to the inter-American system which puts in danger the very future of the Organization of American States."

### Uruguay

• President Gen. Gregorio Alvarez issued an official declaration stating, "Uruguay condemns Great Britain's armed action in the South Atlantic and views the position taken by the United States in the Anglo-Argentine conflict as damaging Latin American unity."

### Mexico

• Pro-British Mexican Foreign Minister Jorge Castañeda was forced by pro-Argentine public opinion to state that the U.S. decision in favor of Britain "has aggravated the situation still further."

## Latin American Parliament

• The Secretary-General of the Latin American Parliament, Peruvian Andrés Townsend Ezcarra, declared, "The attitude of the President of the United States of siding totally with Great Britain . . . denies the very essence of hemispheric solidarity. . . . In an unbelievable gesture, Washington sent the Monroe Doctrine, inter-Americanism, and the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance to the trash heap of history."

## Colombia

• Colombian Foreign Relations Minister Lemos Simmonds, who had joined the United States, Chile, and Trinidad-Tobago in refusing to support Argentina at the Organization of American States meeting April 27, told reporters upon his return to Bogotá, "Time will prove our vote was right." He then broke down in tears.

## From the Argentine U.N. ambassador

*In a May 5 meeting of the Coordinating Body of the Non-Aligned Countries, Argentina's Ambassador to the United Nations, Eduardo Roca, gave a thorough chronology of the U.S. betrayal of an ally in its own hemisphere. An excerpt:*

"There is another fact, which because of its seriousness, deserves to be exposed. . . . I am referring, Mr. President, to the attitude taken by the government of the United States, which gained time for the punitive fleet to reach its destination. Once this objective was achieved, she [the United States] turned its back on its own promises of impartiality. She did not tell the truth about our proposals. She confused its own public opinion. And now, she is helping the colonial aggressor economically and militarily."

Roca then charged that Great Britain has been coordinating with the United States every aggressive move against Argentina. "The facts indicate clearly that the United Kingdom has not wanted to shoot until it could count on the consent, the support, and the complicity of the United States government. Therefore, the United States is becoming as responsible as [Britain]. That is how the peoples of Latin America understand it."

"The Argentine people neither understand nor will they forget that in one of the most critical hours of their history, in contrast to the solidarity that has reached them from every corner of the continent, the United States has chosen to take the side of a power outside the Hemisphere, cooperating with its aggressive designs."

## Britain losing its continental support

by Susan Welsh

---

### West Germany fears escalation

West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt is reported to be extremely worried that the conflict in the South Atlantic could become a confrontation between the superpowers. Following the sinking of the Argentine cruiser *General Belgrano* and the disabling of the British destroyer H.M.S. *Sheffield*, Schmidt met in Bonn with the Portuguese Prime Minister, declaring to the press that "the latest reports from the South Atlantic have very much dismayed us both." Schmidt telephoned British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher when hostilities first broke out, urging her to use restraint. And the Chancellor angrily told his cabinet, according to *Der Spiegel* magazine, that Bonn's agreement to the European Community's economic sanctions against Argentina was not intended as a "blank check" of support for the British.

German public opinion is divided between support for the British and fury against them, although concern at the escalation of the conflict has eroded a great deal of Thatcher's former backing. Many German parliamentarians contacted by *EIR* complained that they were not receiving adequate intelligence on developments in the South Atlantic.

Several officials stressed privately that they were hoping that the United States would drop its support for the British. "Tell Washington that the German government would be ready to follow the U.S. administration if it decided to implement the Monroe Doctrine. . . . This is the only thing that will save both NATO and the European Community from disintegrating," said a senior government source. "We need a bigger power, in fact a superpower, to teach the British a lesson," said another official.

Among German industrialists, anger at the British is most intense. The Federal Republic is Argentina's top EC trading partner, and German firms are losing much