

U.K.'s Malthusian doctrine for NATO

by Lonnie Wolfe

For the past several weeks, NATO Supreme Commander Gen. Bernard Rogers has been publicly repeating arguments used by the leadership of the so-called nuclear freeze movement in support of what he calls a "conventional arms build-up." The American general, with the apparent backing of the Brussels NATO command, has stated that NATO must seek to lessen its reliance on "destabilizing" nuclear weapons, in favor of what he calls a "realistic conventional deterrent."

Rogers's statements show how determined the same Anglo-American cabal behind the Prime espionage fiasco is to force the effective disarming of the Western alliance and its transformation into a British colonial police force for population-butchering wars in the developing sector.

While the talk of a conventional deterrent has been floating around more lunatic military circles in the Western alliance for some time, it exploded into prominence with the publication last spring of an article in *Foreign Affairs*, the journal of the New York Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), by former U.S. Defense Secretary and raving Malthusian Robert McNamara and three other cold warriors from the Kennedy-Vietnam era. The article by this "gang of four" proposed that the United States and NATO pledge a unilateral non-first use of nuclear weapons, but only after the alliance built up a "credible" conventional deterrent.

McNamara, who placed most of the battlefield nuclear forces in Europe, knows very well that the Soviets have no intention of launching a "conventional attack" on Europe that would be met by conventional NATO forces. McNamara is in fact not concerned about the defense of Europe at all. He believes that the major theater of conflict is the developing sector.

By pledging to not use nuclear weapons, McNamara is looking for an unlimited license for conventional wars, outside the NATO area in the developing sector. To hook the Soviets on this proposition, McNamara and his British sponsors must stop the development of new generations of weapons technology, including the beam ABM systems. He is in fact proposing unilateral strategic disarmament.

Laundering the garbage

No self-respecting military officer or national policymaker would dare believe any of this nonsense if it were presented in this fashion. Therefore, the McNamara strategy had to be presented in another form.

At the same time that the *Foreign Affairs* article was being drafted and circulated through CFR and London International Institute for Strategic Studies policy circles, the British launched their own "conventional build-up" lobby.

In early 1982, a few dozen British and American defense policy experts and former officers were put together under the "European Security Study" or as it is more commonly called, ESECS. The purpose of ESECS, headed by MIT professor and Club of Rome executive member Carroll Wilson, was to study the balance of forces along NATO's central front. In typical British fashion the ESECS crew, which included Field Marshal Lord Carrer and McNamara coauthor McGeorgy Bundy, added the numbers of weapons and troops and came up with the idea that NATO should build up its conventional forces to avoid reliance on its nuclear weapons. In that way the McNamara scheme is being laundered, as the Rogers statements demonstrate. ESECS will be releasing part of its findings soon and the plan is to use them to force changes in alliance policy.

At the same time, sources close to the NATO command report that there are several plans floating around for a broad reorganization of the alliance. A London-backed plan, which has the support of the McNamara crowd in the United States calls for the creation of a British-dominated European defense community. Meanwhile, the British-manipulated United States would join with mother England and France in a more informal directorate that would facilitate deployments into the developing sector. This latter would be the action arm of NATO, de facto, while the main role for the former would be to shift supplies, troops, etc. to assist the out-of-area deployments. Sources close to the Brussels NATO command report that plans are ready for the first stages of implementation of this proposal, awaiting only the full approval of the U.S. government and the White House to go ahead.

The Prime connection

There is an immediate connection to the Prime affair in this.

One of the architects of the Vietnam War and the new Malthusian warfare doctrine, retired General Maxwell Taylor, stated in an interview published in *Executive Intelligence Review* in 1981 that he and his sponsors in the genocidal Draper Fund/Population Crisis Committee had "written off" more than a billion people in the developing sector. The oligarchical-controlled Draper Fund, Taylor asserted, had assurances from sections of the Soviet leadership that it would tolerate the butchery of more than a billion people in the developing sector, provided nuclear weapons were not used. The channel for collaboration on this genocide is the same British channel exposed by the Prime affair, and before it by the Philby and McLean affairs.

While the conventional build-up scheme has made dangerous inroads in U.S. policy circles, it has yet to achieve total success. Should the Prime affair cause some patriotic Americans to sober up, it need not ever succeed.